

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o LXXXVIII. JULY 1897.

ART. I.—OUR LORD'S DIVINE AND HUMAN
KNOWLEDGE.

The Principle of the Incarnation, with especial reference to the relation between our Lord's Divine Omniscience and His Human Consciousness. By H. C. POWELL, M.A. (London, 1896.)

MR. POWELL has done well in placing in the front of his Treatise an account of the views of Professor Godet on what is somewhat irreverently called the Kenosis. It is a great thing that the student should see clearly and at once what the character of this modern theory is in its full expression. As the statement comes before us in a brief and concise form, we cannot do better, as a preliminary to the remarks we have to make, than to copy it. Professor Godet remarks :

'Our Lord had been in possession of the Divine Omnipotence, and He enters upon a form of existence in which, instead of commanding and bestowing gifts, He has to receive, to ask, and to obey ; and it is only at the last moment of this new stage of existence that He announces, as an event of recent occurrence, this fact : "All power is given unto Me in Heaven and on earth."

'He had been a sharer in the Divine Omniscience, and He accepts a condition in which He has ceaselessly to ask, constantly to learn, often to remain in ignorance, as when He says : "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son."

'He had been filling all things, sharing in the omnipotence of God Himself, and He confines Himself within a human body, so localized that it could be said of Him : "*If Thou hadst been here, such a thing would not have happened.*"

'In Him there had been abiding the immutable holiness, and He accepted a state of being of which one of the fundamental laws

VOL. XLIV.—NO. LXXXVIII.

T

is liberty of choice, the possibility of undergoing real temptation, and consequently the power to sin.

'He had been loving with all the force of a perfect, infinite love, and this kind of love He exchanges for one which implies progress both in respect of intensity and of comprehension.

'He knew Himself as the Son, with that knowledge with which the Father Himself knows Him eternally, and (this is that putting off upon which all those we have already mentioned depend) this consciousness of Sonship, which was the light of His life, He allowed to be extinguished within Him, to retain only His inalienable personality; the individual life endued with freedom and intelligence as all human individuality is endued; for our personality is made in the image of His. By means of this humiliation He was enabled to enter into a course of human development similar in all respects to our own.

'Here we see the prodigy of love which is realized in the life of Christ, and revealed to us by His Word. If this miracle is not possible God is not free, and His love has limitations imposed upon it.'

Such is the doctrine of Professor Godet. It goes a great deal further than those among ourselves who have entered on the same path would be willing to follow. But the path is a dangerous one. We see how dangerous from the uncertainty and confusion by which the wayfarers amongst ourselves are beset. They stop short, they hesitate, they get confused, and often make statements at variance with the theory and what they have said before. One would fain hope that, warned by this very mist and darkness, they may be induced to retrace their steps. Truth is always clear and keen-edged; it is only error which hides itself in confusion.

Looking, now, steadily at Professor Godet's teaching, we see clearly that it is unthinkable. Professor Godet does not deny that the Incarnate One continued to be God; but he holds that in the Incarnate State all that He retained of His Godhead was his nude Personality. All the above named attributes—all, in a word, which constitutes the Divine Nature He *exchanged*, He *put off*. But this is unthinkable. It is true that theologians distinguish between the Personality and the Nature; but that is a mere distinction *in logic*. *In reality* the Nature is inseparable from the Person. Exchange or put off the Nature and you inevitably exchange and put off the Person.¹ Professor Godet's position could not possibly be a

¹ The inseparability of the Personality from the Nature is further seen from the popular use of the term personality. A man's personality, in the popular use of the term, embraces not only the essential parts of his nature, but the points of his character, and even his habits and peculiarities. They all, in the popular view, make up his personality. It is

permanent one. If it were seriously taken up and held, it would infallibly lead to a denial of the Incarnation.

Then, again, see how completely Professor Godet's view destroys the rational ground on which the Church believes in the Divinity of our Lord. That ground consists of two elements: first, His claim to be God, and secondly, the verification of this claim by the facts of the Gospel History—the Epiphanies or manifestations of His Divine Glory. But, according to the theory, His assertions of His Godhead were the assertions of a fallible manhood, and there was in His Incarnate life no Divine Glory to be manifested. We ask in wonder, How could faith in His Godhead survive this catastrophe? But there is another point in Professor Godet's theory which touches us more deeply. It is clear that the theory, if adopted, would change the whole Christian system. The words Revelation, Redemption, Grace flowing forth from the Incarnate One, by which we are lifted up to the higher life, must disappear; and what have we got in their place? Nothing else but a human teacher and a human example—the teacher influenced by the ideas of a remote age, and the example sadly marred by extraordinary claims.

But our present object is not to criticize. Rather we place this statement before our readers by way of warning. We desire to point out the gulf that lies before all who in this matter depart from the settled teaching of the Undivided Church. We think those who have entered upon this path have failed to grasp all the conditions of the great problem. The great doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were finally settled after a long and weary struggle, in which were mingled much human imperfection—nay, much sin and wickedness. But the settlement was not by man, but by God. It was brought about, we entirely believe, by the guiding and working of the Spirit of God, who dwelt in the Undivided Church. And it is important to observe the principle on which all these decisions were made. It was not a desire to develop old doctrines or to introduce new ones; rather it was an impassioned determination to preserve in their integrity the revelations of the Gospels on these high matters. And in this the Church was entirely successful. These decisions in their sum form a compact and wonderful whole—a whole which no one can contemplate without a deep impression of its Divinity. And further, as a whole the decisions are so bound together that you cannot alter or add to them without clear that this popular use of the term could never have arisen except from the perception that person is inseparable from nature.

destroying the whole edifice. It is a great thing, too, to notice that they commend themselves to the consciences of mankind as the only view of the Gospel revelation which can really meet the wants of sinful and suffering humanity. Surely if ever there were decisions that were irreformable, these are such.

Mr. Powell's book, though entitled the *Principle of the Incarnation*, yet deals more especially with the difficult problem of the relation between our Lord's Divine Omniscience and His human consciousness, or, as we should prefer to say, His human knowledge. He treats this great subject in three books—in the first, from the point of view of philosophy; in the second, from the point of view of theology; and in the third, from the point of view of the Gospels. Of the second and third parts we wish to speak in terms of the highest commendation. They are clear, accurate, and, in their arguments, very able, and we hope they may be extensively read and studied by all who are interested in this question. Of the first, or philosophical book, we are unable to speak in the same terms. We cannot agree with the philosophical rendering which Mr. Powell has given to our Lord's human knowledge. This we deeply regret for many reasons, and our first thought was to pass over the first part lightly, merely indicating one or two points which we thought wrong. Further thought, however, revealing as it did the effect which this rendering is calculated to have not only on the problem in question but on the faith generally, led us to alter our resolve.

It is a grave question whether the dogmas of the faith ought to be mixed up at all with philosophical principles. We have the warning of St. Paul against it,¹ and certainly the experience of the Christian Church has justified that warning. The influence of Platonism on the early Church was in many respects bad, and so also was the influence of Aristotelianism in the middle ages. But, waiving the general question, there is a special reason why, in dealing with the dogmas of the faith, we should keep clear of the philosophies at present in vogue. *We believe that they rest on a fundamentally false view of things, and that their influence on theology and on Christian faith generally is wholly bad.* In order to make this clear, we have thought it right to treat the philosophical problem more at large. And in doing so our first point will be to exhibit as pointedly and briefly as possible the fundamental principles which underlie present philosophies, and to

¹ 'Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy.'—Col. ii. 8.

show their effect upon theology and ethics, and even on science.

There are two great systems or schools of philosophy at the present day—viz. the Transcendental and the Empirical; and it is of great importance that we should look at the genesis of these systems, as it is only in that way we shall be able to understand aright their drift and the leading ideas which underlie each.

The crisis which gave birth to them arose out of a remark made by Locke. Treating of concepts, or general notions, he remarked upon the great difficulty which, as he conceived, attended the formation of them. Thus in the case of our general notion of a triangle, he said, it requires some pains and skill to form such a notion, 'for it must be neither oblique nor rectangle, neither equilateral, equicrural, nor scalenon, but *all and none* of these at once.'¹ Bishop Berkeley at once fastened upon this statement, and roundly asserted the impossibility of forming general notions.² At first sight it may appear as if this were but a trifling dispute between two great philosophers. In reality, however, it was not so. It would simply be impossible to exaggerate the far-reaching importance of this decision taken by Berkeley. General notions are the productions of the intellect; they are a kind of knowledge peculiar to the intellect. In denying, therefore, their existence or possibility, he in effect denied the existence of the intellect, properly so called, and the existence of the kind of knowledge which is its product. He in effect narrowed down and limited human knowledge to the impressions of sense, and to the faint copies of these impressions which exist in the memory and the imagination.

Before going further, we would wish to point out what, so far as we know, has never yet been pointed out—the fallacy which underlay the whole procedure. Both Locke and Berkeley, and, for that matter, the whole series of their successors in the Empirical philosophy, formed, and have continued to form, a wholly false idea of the nature of a general notion. They looked upon it as a mental *image*; and of course, if that is so, Berkeley is right. It is impossible to picture forth in the imagination an image which shall correspond to every variety of triangle. But the nature of a general notion is something wholly different. It is not an image, but a *rule or law*. It is something which is perceived solely by the intellect as existing in things; and as a rule or law it is

¹ *Human Understanding*, bk. iv. chap. vii. sec. 9.

² *Principles of Human Knowledge*, Introduction, p. xiii.

wholly unfigured and unfigurable. If we look at general notions in this light, it is easy to see that the difficulty Locke supposed in forming them is wholly imaginary. Our general notion of a triangle, for instance, is nothing else but the rule or law of construction, which, as inhering in that figure, constitutes or makes it to be a triangle. It is a rule which is equally applicable to triangles of every description, and, so far from being difficult of apprehension, it is so clear to the intellect that a boy can be taught it in five minutes, and he will never forget it.

Berkeley, having thus eliminated the intellect and the kind of knowledge which is its product, immediately proceeded to apply his principle by denying the substantiality of the outer world. The substantiality of the outer world is a perception of the intellect. It is a perception which cannot possibly be represented by an image of sense. Hence, since by his principle human knowledge consists only of the impressions of sense and their faint copies, the outer world, so he argued, can be nothing else but impressions made upon our minds. His argument is unassailable if we admit his principle, but only so on that condition. If we deny his principle it immediately falls to the ground.

But Berkeley did not perceive that his principle went a great deal further. It was reserved for Hume to carry it out to its full extent. Reasoning after the method of Berkeley, he dealt with the human soul viewed as a spiritual entity or personality, as Berkeley had dealt with the outer world. The human soul, viewed as a personal existence, is also a perception of the intellect; and it cannot, any more than the substance of the world, be represented by an image of sense. Hence it must share the same fate as the substance of the world. But Hume pushed the Berkeleian principle a great deal further. There are other things besides the substance of the world and the personality of the soul which cannot be represented by an image of sense. There is the great principle of cause and effect. It is a principle which is quite as important in the eye of science as the personality of the soul is in the eye of theology. But as a principle it is perfectly unfigurable. Hence it, too, for this reason must be excluded from the sphere of human knowledge, and Hume excluded it. The effect was most remarkable. By this procedure Hume cut asunder the main string by which human knowledge can be assorted into system. Human knowledge, therefore, in his hands fell asunder into a disconnected stream of impressions of sense and their faint copies, sorted, it is

true, into groups, but only so by the blind principle of association.

In this way Hume laid the foundation of the modern Empirical philosophy, and to his main position, the corner stone of the system, his followers down to the present day have held fast.¹ Let the reader carefully note and fix in his mind that main position. It may be stated thus: Human knowledge is limited to impressions of sense and their faint copies in memory and imagination. To which must be added the obvious corollary, that anything which comes before us in the guise of human knowledge which cannot be figured in sense and imagination, is not real knowledge, but simply illusion. We shall presently consider the bearing of this principle. In the meantime what we ask is that it may be carefully noted.

Let us now pass to the opposite system, the transcendental philosophy. Kant, its founder, for many years pondered over the system of Hume; and the problem before his mind was simply this: How was he to supply the strings which bind together the particulars of human knowledge into unity and system? Hume, as we have seen, had cut these strings, and had reduced human knowledge to an unordered stream of impressions and their copies; where could Kant find a principle which would again bring back rational order into our knowledge? It would have been well had he simply restored the human intellect and the concepts which are its product to the place from which Berkeley had cast them down; for the human intellect and its concepts are the real strings which bind human knowledge into unity and system. Unhappily this was not the course he pursued. He strove to attain his object by imposing *a priori* laws or fetters upon the human mind. The human mind, he held, is fettered in regard to sense; for it is compelled by its structure or constitution to spread out its impressions in space and to fix them in time. In like manner he imposed similar fetters upon the understanding or intellect. These fetters or *a priori* laws he termed categories; and their operation is to this effect—to compel the intellect to gather up the impressions of sense into bundles, and to externalize them. When this process is completed the categories of substance and of cause and effect come into play.

¹ If anyone wishes to see how entirely modern Empiricists have held to Hume's main position, let him read over the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Mr. J. S. Mill's *Examination of the Philosophy of Sir W. Hamilton*.

These bundles are not really substances ; at least, we do not know, and never can know, whether they are or not. All that we know is that we are compelled by the structure of our intellect to think them to be substances. So also in regard to changes in the externalized entities. The changes are not really brought about by causes ; at least, we do not know that they are. All we do know is, that the intellect in dealing with them is compelled to think them to be causes and effects.

If we look at these statements closely we shall see that practically Kant did not advance beyond Hume. If the outer world of Hume was destitute of all substantiality, so was also the outer world of Kant. There is only this difference between them—a difference which shows that Kant advanced further on the road to scepticism than Hume. In Hume our impressions come to us, no one knows whence ; but at least we have the satisfaction of thinking they come to us *ready made*. In Kant, on the other hand, it is not an impression, but a stimulus, that comes to us out of the unknown ; and out of that stimulus the faculty of sense *manufactures* the impression in virtue of its *a priori* laws. The remarkable result of this position is, that the world we see around us is purely *phenomenal*, and that it is the *creation*, not of the living God, but of the human mind acting in obedience to its *a priori* laws.

There is only one other point in the Kantian system that we need notice. We have seen that the cardinal fault of the system of Hume was that it limited human knowledge to impressions and their copies, excluding altogether the knowledge of the intellect. Kant attained exactly the same end by his principle that human knowledge is limited to experience. By experience he means that knowledge which is manufactured by the senses and the intellect ; and he holds that that is the only knowledge which can properly be called knowledge. It is true that in appearance the severity of this principle was modified ; and it was done in this way. Kant assumed a third faculty in the human mind—viz. the reason, which towers above both senses and intellect ; and he held that the reason is set in motion by means of three ideas that are seated in it. They are the idea of God as the sum of all reality, the idea of a real external world, and the idea of a personality attaching to the human soul. But we have hardly had time to be grateful for this precious gift when it is rudely snatched back from us by the pronouncement that these ideas are not real knowledge. They are *Schein*—we might say in English, moonshine—pure illusion.

It was necessary to mention these points in the Kantian system in order to exhibit its drift. But we do not ask the reader to do more than to fix well in his mind the fundamental principle of that system—viz. a fettered mind, fettered senses, a fettered intellect, and, for that matter, a fettered reason also. How important it is that he should do so will be seen presently. In the meantime we would only remark, that this principle in its integrity has passed to all Kant's successors in the transcendental philosophy. It was taken up first by his immediate Pantheistic successors, and pushed further to its logical conclusion. Since their time transcendentalism has been variously modified; but in every form of it the principle of a fettered mind remains as the corner stone. What, too, we have especially to notice is, that the fundamental principle passed into the Hamiltonian philosophy, and was developed in their own way by Sir W. Hamilton and Dr. Mansel.

Let us now look at the effect of these systems on theology, ethics, and science; and in so doing it will be necessary to follow the lines of pure logic. It is true that by doing so we may seem unfair to individuals. There are many writers, for instance, who are thoroughly imbued with the principles of the empirical philosophy who have not altogether forsaken the ground of common sense, and who do not push their principles against obvious facts. All the same, however, the principles remain in their minds, and as dull unreasoning prejudice are effective against facts less obvious. Even experts of the empirical philosophy have not uniformly pushed their principles. Neither Hume nor Mr. J. S. Mill ventured to urge their principles against science. And even in presence of other facts, such as the personality of the human soul, both Hume and Mill were staggered, and Mill candidly intimated that the facts manifesting personality agreed badly with his philosophy. But then against other facts less clearly known neither of these great writers showed the slightest hesitation. On the question of miracles Hume had no hesitation whatever; and neither he nor Mill were backward in pressing their principles against the freedom of the will. Hence we must deal with the matter from the point of view of pure logic. It is to be remembered that we are not here criticizing individuals; we are studying the effect of these philosophies on various branches of knowledge. And that cannot be done effectively except on the basis of pure logic.

Taking, then, the empirical philosophy, let us see in the first place how it affects theology. In regard to the funda-

mental principle of theology, belief in God, it is clear that the empirical philosophy excludes from man all knowledge of God. God, like the human soul or the substance of the world, cannot be represented by an impression or its copy. Clearly, therefore, since human knowledge is limited to impressions and their copies, God lies outside the sphere of human knowledge. Hence, in presence of this fact, the obvious course for an empiricist to take would be to deny the existence of God, and set down belief in Him as an illusion. Atheism, however, is a bad name, and few writers of respectability would care to incur it. For the most part, therefore, they have limited themselves to a criticism of the proofs or manifestations of God's existence; and, as a result, finding them baseless, they have lamented their insufficiency. Quite recently, however, a somewhat bolder line has been taken. It is now asserted that we neither know nor can know whether God exists or not; and that our attitude towards this dogma ought to be one of pure agnosticism. In any case, it is clear that this philosophy shakes our faith in God to its very foundation; and this is really a portentous fact to which we must give full weight. If we consider it, we shall see how far-reaching it is. It is clear that it shakes or destroys not only our faith in Creation and Providence, but in all the dogmas which grow out of the Christian revelation. In regard to Creation and Providence, they are indeed excluded on other grounds. For, from the point of view of empiricism, there is really no world to create; and such a shadowy world as is left to us, is ordered, not by Divine Providence, but by the association of ideas. But it is as bearing on the Christian revelation that we have especially to consider the subversion of the Divine Existence. It is clear that in regard to Revelation, Prophecy, Miracle, the Incarnation, and the Supernatural generally, the ground is taken away on which they rest. For unless the Divine Existence stands out clear and certain before the intellect and the conscience, it is perfectly hopeless to argue about them.

Then look at the effect of empiricism on the hope of a future life. Our mental nature having no substantiality or personality, being in fact nothing else but a 'stream of consciousness,' the natural conclusion is that when that stream ceases to flow in death the man comes to an end. It is true that Stuart Mill has said that the immortality men desire is a continuance of our present life; and he thinks it is just as easy to believe in the continuance of a stream of consciousness, as it is to believe in the survival of a personal soul.

This, however, we greatly doubt. But, apart from this, there is this further pregnant fact. Empiricism, by a gross inconsequence, naturally allies itself with materialism. It regards the stream of consciousness as purely a product of the bodily organization. And, of course, if that be so, the stream must cease to flow on the dissolution of the body.

Let us next turn to Ethics. We need not spend time in proving that no system of ethics worthy of the name can be constructed, except on the postulate of the freedom of the will.¹ The thing is clear enough to common sense; and in point of fact the whole battle of human life is summed up in this, that the human soul shall by its native energy struggle against and overcome opposing conditions, and so rise through warfare and suffering to the higher life. We must *believe* that those conditions can be overcome, else the battle cannot be fought. But to deny the freedom of the will is to believe that they cannot be overcome; and the soul which once adopts this belief inevitably gives up the struggle, and sinks down into acquiescence in its slavery. We thus see that the freedom of the will is a principle which is absolutely essential to ethics. But it is a principle which has no place in empiricism; for the freedom of the will cannot be maintained except on the further principle of the personality of the soul. If with empiricism we deny personality, and reduce the human soul to a stream of consciousness, we get an entity which cannot be supposed to be free, and which is hardly capable of fighting a battle. There is thus nothing left to the empirical philosopher on the sphere of ethics, except to construct systems of utilitarianism, which have no hold whatever on struggling humanity. Empiricism is, in truth, just as fatal to ethics as it is to theology.

If next we turn to science, we see a curious phenomenon in the procedure of the empirical philosophy. In reality empiricism is just as subversive of science as it is of theology and ethics. The essence of science is the discovery of laws of nature. Take away laws of nature, and science falls to the ground. But there is no place for laws of nature in the empirical philosophy. A law of nature is a pure production of the intellect. It is a concept or general notion; and as such is absolutely unfigured and unfigurable. You cannot by any possibility extract it from impressions and their copies. The empirical philosophy is therefore bound, if it is to be logical, to deny the possibility of laws of nature, just as it

¹ For a clear demonstration of this point we would refer the reader to the opening chapter of Mr. Balfour's *Foundations of Belief*.

denies the possibility of other general notions. It is bound, in fact, to pronounce that the great body of scientific knowledge, called laws of nature, which has been accumulated by science, is as illusive and imaginary as are the dogmas of theology.

This point is so important that we desire to emphasize it. Take, for instance, our knowledge of God. That is a knowledge which is the pure product of the intellect. It is a knowledge which cannot possibly be represented by an impression or its copy; and for that, *and for no other reason*, it is rejected as illusive knowledge by the empirical philosophy. But the law of universal gravitation stands upon exactly the same footing. That also is knowledge which is a pure product of the intellect. It is knowledge, too, which cannot be represented by an impression or its copy. Clearly, therefore, by parity of reason, it also ought to be rejected as illusive knowledge. Why is it not rejected? For no other reason than because empiricism cannot afford to break with science. To do so would be to reduce itself to absurdity. Hence, ever since the days of Berkeley and Hume the procedure of empirical philosophers has consisted mainly of frantic efforts to extract out of impressions and their copies something which may resemble, however remotely, laws of nature. We have had theories of induction and generalization without number—theories which it has been the delight of Mr. Balfour, in his own inimitable way, to pull to pieces.

It may serve, by way of contrast, to illustrate the futility of these highly laboured and unsatisfactory theories, if we point out that the procedure of science in the discovery of laws of nature is the simplest thing in the world. The scientific intellect pondering over the composition of natural objects and their changes, deciphers or conjectures the laws which govern that composition and these changes. If amongst these conjectured laws any one stands out as at all probable, it is immediately subjected to the strictest tests. It is tested by experiment, it is tested by further observation and comparison with ascertained laws; and, if suitable, it is subjected to mathematical treatment. If it comes through all these tests unscathed it is regarded as a new discovery, and takes its place as an ascertained law of nature.

Turning next to the Transcendental system, we find that it is not less hostile to theology than empiricism. In order to see this, we have only to call to mind the particulars we have already given and to observe how they work out. The principle of a *priori* laws or fetters imposed upon the mind

leads inevitably to the doctrine that the world we see around us is a phenomenal world, and that it is the creation, not of the living God, but of the human mind. Of course this destroys the main proof of God's existence, and, more than this, it brings in a mode of looking at the world of things in which belief in God can have no place. It, in fact, led directly to Pantheism in Kant's immediate successors. But the knowledge of God is also formally excluded from the sphere of human knowledge by Kant's principle of the limitation of human knowledge to experience: that is to say, only that knowledge is real knowledge which is manufactured by the senses and the intellect. It is true, as we have seen, that there is some abatement from this in the fact that the *idea* of God formed one of the three ideas of reason. But it was not really an abatement, inasmuch as these ideas were pronounced to be *Schein*, or illusion.

It is only fair, however, to Kant to say that he contented himself with simply excluding the knowledge of God from the sphere of human knowledge. His successors, however, have not been contented with this reserved attitude. They have gone further, and have maintained that our knowledge of God is self-contradictory and impossible. J. G. Fichte, so far as we know, was the first who took this line, and he was followed with some hesitation and abatement by Sir W. Hamilton and Dr. Mansel. In any case, both Kant and his successors have excluded or destroyed our knowledge of God, and hence we see that, in so far as our knowledge of God is concerned, the transcendental system is as agnostic as is the empirical; perhaps more dangerously so, inasmuch as it is more closely reasoned. But what we have at present to look at is the effect that this has upon theology. Of course, the effect is precisely the same as in empiricism. God being excluded from the sphere of human knowledge, it is idle to speak of His revealing Himself; it is idle to speak of His manifesting His Presence and working by miraculous tokens; and it is idle to speak of the Incarnation or the Redemption. In regard to the question of a future life, Kant did not absolutely deny the personality of the human soul, though he excluded it from human knowledge. It might seem, therefore, that his system is not so directly in the way of future hope as is that of empiricism. But there is this incongruity attaching to the idea of a future life, if a Transcendentalist could bring himself to believe in it. Our senses and our intellect being completely fettered, it would follow that if we survived the present life our minds would imme-

diately proceed to create a phenomenal world in all respects the same as the present. Clearly such a future life would be quite alien to Christian hope.

But the most interesting part of the Kantian system is its treatment of ethics. It is clearly seen that the *Criticism of Pure Reason* is as fatal to a genuine system of ethics as it is to theology; for, as we have seen, it has no place for God, no place for freedom, no place for immortality. What, under these circumstances, did Kant do? In dealing with ethics he shook himself free from the fetters of the *Pure Reason* by introducing a new principle, the principle of *faith*. He postulated, as essential to ethics, the existence of an 'Author of Nature,' the hope of immortality, and the fact of human freedom. No doubt, if tested by the principles of knowledge contained in the *Pure Reason*, all these things are inadmissible; but they are none the less essential to a genuine system of ethics, and therefore they ought to be believed. From this point of view Kant constructed an ethical system in many respects admirable; but it was at the fearful price of introducing disharmony into the nature of man. We have here, in fact, the origin of that supposed conflict between reason and faith which has sat like a nightmare upon the educated mind of Europe for the last hundred years, and which has been so much misunderstood. Popularly it has been supposed that this conflict is the result of advancing science. But this is a profound mistake, for the principles which originate the conflict would, if carried out logically, be just as fatal to science as they are to theology. This we proceed to show.

The Kantian system does not attack science in the same way as empiricism does—that is, by denying the possibility of laws of nature. But it wounds science in a far more sensitive part. It is clear that science reposes on the postulate that what we term laws of nature are embodied in the objects and changes of nature. They are the laws which govern the composition of natural objects and the changes to which they are subjected; and the function of science is, by studying these objects and changes, to ascertain and decipher them. But in the Kantian system the laws of nature do not exist in the objects of nature, but only in the human understanding. It is the understanding of man which, acting on its *a priori* laws, prescribes or imposes these laws upon nature. In truth, the laws of nature, so far from being embodied in nature, are nothing but the reflection of the human understanding. Of course, if this is so, scientific men are working on the wrong

track. They are studying outer nature and its changes in search of laws; they would attain their object far more effectually if they would study the human understanding, which is the real and only source of these laws.

If, now, we bear in mind that these two systems of philosophy—the Transcendental and Empirical—have held the field almost without a rival for the last hundred years, we shall be able to understand the immense effect they have had in giving to educated thought a shape and a tendency antagonistic to theology. Science, of course, can take care of itself, and ethics also to a certain extent; but it is different altogether with theology. It lies in a higher sphere; the verities it deals with are remote from ordinary thought; and it requires a finer intellectual perception and a fuller moral sympathy to lay hold of them. They have therefore, before the forum of educated thought, no defence against those false principles which we have shown are, if logically carried out, equally subversive of science and ethics. There is no doubt but that it is the continual inculcation of these false principles which has produced that alienation from Christian faith which is so characteristic of the educated public of the present day. Some may perhaps be inclined to doubt this, on the ground that students of philosophy are comparatively few in number. They forget that between the philosophers and the public there is a whole host of authors who expound and popularize philosophical principles. These popular expositions are often exaggerated, and not seldom altogether wrong, but, being continually presented to the educated public in newspapers and periodicals, they have gradually created a tendency of thought and habit of mind antagonistic to Christian faith.

As the point is of great importance, it may be well to show how the popular exposition works. Let us take as a specimen Mr. Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma*.¹ It is a popular polemic against the idea of God, against miracles, and the supernatural generally. In dealing with our idea of God, this is his way of proceeding. J. G. Fichte, who was the first of the Kantians to proclaim the incongruity or impossibility of the Divine idea, had said: 'Ihr habt nicht wie ihr wolltet Gott gedacht, sondern nur euch selbst im Denken vervielfältigt.' This thought Matthew Arnold turned into the racy expression: 'A magnified and non-natural man.' We see at a glance the immense effect which this phrase was calculated to have on the popular mind. It has just enough of plausibility to give it impetus. It presupposes that our

¹ See also Professor Huxley's popular works.

idea of God is built up out of impressions of sense ; and of course, if this is so, both Fichte and Arnold are right. We could only get in this way a magnified or distorted image of Him. But the case is altogether different if our idea of God is pure intellectual knowledge, a knowledge in which the impressions of sense have no place whatever. But how few of Matthew Arnold's readers would perceive the latent fallacy.¹

We think we have now said enough to show the one-sidedness and the danger to the faith inherent in both these great philosophies now prevalent, and to warrant our position that the dogmas of theology ought not to be mixed up with either. But before passing from the point, we desire, in reference more especially to the transcendental system, to extract from what we have said a golden rule, a rule of priceless value. It is this :

Just as no system of ethics worthy of the name is possible except on the postulate of the freedom of the will, so no system of theology is possible except on the postulate of the freedom of the intellect—its freedom to cognize everything that can fairly be brought before it, in the exact form in which it is brought before it.

We have limited ourselves, in drawing up the above rule, to theology, but it is a rule which applies with equal force to science. The principle of a fettered intellect is just as fatal to science as it is to theology. For, clearly, if our intellect is compelled by its constitution to cognize things only in a certain way, the vast body of laws which it has been the glory of science to accumulate are not laws of *nature*, but purely subjective notions manufactured by the intellect. Viewed as laws of *nature* they are as unreal, as illusive, as any dogma of theology could possibly be. What a pity no one has taken the trouble to demonstrate this ! While the principle of a fettered intellect has been worked remorselessly against theology, no one has ventured to apply it as against science. How are we to account for this ? Possibly the anticipation of the storm of ridicule that would be sure to overtake such

¹ See J. G. Fichte, 'Die moralische Weltordnung,' *Werke*, v. 187. In the paragraph from which the above quotation is taken Fichte insists that our idea of God is built up out of the impression we have of our human personality, and out of the empirical or waking consciousness. These two elements multiplied to infinity give our idea of God. It is a position which, from a theological point, is quite absurd. It is to be remembered, however, that the paragraph in question was penned in the heat of the *Atheismusstreit*, and therefore ought not to be taken altogether seriously. At all events, in later times he had more reasonable views.

an attempt has been sufficient to deter people from making it. But, if that is so, surely that anticipated ridicule is the exact measure of the hollowness of nineteenth-century scepticism in regard to theology.

We next come to consider the rendering which Mr. Powell has given to human knowledge generally, and of course also to the human knowledge of our Lord. This is the main point on which we are compelled, with very great regret, to differ from him; and our regret is all the keener, inasmuch as for his work otherwise we have the highest admiration. Mr. Powell has arrived at his conclusion on this point by taking as his guide in philosophy Dr. Mansel—a great name undoubtedly. We also have the highest admiration for Dr. Mansel's philosophical genius. He was a man possessed of wonderful mental power, and his treatment of metaphysical subjects was remarkable for keenness of insight, a firm grasp of the matter in hand, and thoroughness in carrying his theme to its logical issue. But unhappily Dr. Mansel inherited from Sir William Hamilton the great Kantian principle of a fettered mind, and much of his metaphysical career was spent in elucidating and carrying out that principle. It may be well, therefore, for the better understanding of the matter, to make some remarks on the Hamiltonian position generally.

One cannot read the famous article of Sir W. Hamilton in the *Edinburgh Review* without a deep feeling that he almost stumbled into the position which he afterwards held with such tenacity. The main portion of the article was directed against the Pantheistic infinite of Schelling, and not directly against the Divine infinity. What Schelling desired to establish was an infinite *ἀρχή*, or first principle, which might be the ground and root of his Pantheistic system. The idea of such an infinite first principle was nothing better than a chimera; it was an impossibility; and Schelling utterly failed in his attempt to set it up. But the whole Pantheistic system of Schelling, being charged with deep feeling, and being full of romance and poetry, was highly attractive and dangerous, so that no Christian theologian could do otherwise than rejoice at its refutation. But in refuting it Hamilton unfortunately took the ground that the human mind is so constituted as to be incapable of knowing infinity. Of infinity, Hamilton maintained, we can have no positive or real knowledge, but only a knowledge which is purely negative. We see at once that the position thus taken up, although directed primarily against the dead Pantheistic infinite, yet affects indirectly, and

in a vital manner, our knowledge of the infinite living God. In truth, Hamilton, in taking up ultimately the position that our minds are so constituted as to be capable of knowing only the finite, puts himself in line with the two great philosophies we have been considering. Hume had taught that human knowledge is limited to impressions of sense and their copies. Kant practically agreed with him when he limited knowledge to experience; and it came to exactly the same thing when Hamilton declared the only knowledge possible to us to be a knowledge of the finite.

We need not spend time in showing, what we have already endeavoured to show, how fatal this position is, not only to our knowledge of the living God, but to theology generally. But, before going further, it may be well for the sake of younger students to indicate as briefly and pointedly as may be what we conceive to be the fallacy underlying the Hamiltonian position. The arguments by which Sir W. Hamilton supports his position—that no positive knowledge of infinity is possible to us—are derived from the consideration of space, time, magnitude, number, cause, and effect. He shows clearly enough that we cannot think an infinite space, nor an infinite time, nor a magnitude, nor a number so great that it cannot be added to, nor a regress of cause and effect stretching to infinity. His argument is perfectly conclusive; but it is wholly beside the point. Why is it that we cannot think any of these entities infinite? It is because they are all forms of the finite world, and, being so, they are essentially finite. Hamilton attributed our inability to think them infinite to the weakness of our minds, constituted as they are; but it is clear that no mind, however great, could possibly think them to be other than what they actually are, finite.¹

The truth is, that Hamilton looked in the wrong direction for infinity. He looked to the finite world. But if we reflect on the matter, we shall see clearly that infinity, if it exists at all, is to be found, not in the finite world, but in the world of mind. And the general sense of mankind has so understood

¹ There is this complication, however, in regard to space and time. Kant pointed out that space and time are not only intuitions of sense, they are also conceptions of the intellect. Hence arises the complication. As intuitions of sense, space and time are essentially finites; but as concepts of the intellect they share, with other concepts, the property of being universals or infinities. It is from not distinguishing between these two points of view that all the confusion and argumentation has arisen as to whether the universe is infinite or finite in space, and infinite or finite in time.

the matter. The Infinite One is the Supreme and Perfect Mind. In His image, we are told, the human mind has been created; and had Hamilton only directed his attention to the human mind as that which alone can be studied, he would have found—we do not say infinity, but he would have found traces enough pointing in that direction sufficient to convince him that mankind have a real and positive notion of infinity. Take, for instance, the human mind, and examine it first in reference to sense. It is certain that no object, however great, can be presented to the human mind which it will not transcend. Even the universe, great as it is, is not greater than our mind; for if we could be transported to its utmost verge our mind would still stretch beyond. In fact—setting aside the limitations of our present material existence, which might conceivably be changed, and which do not affect the innate knowing power of the mind—it is certain that *no limit*, at least no limit that we can conceive, *can possibly be put* to that knowing power. So also in the sphere of intellect, the general notions which are its product are, as logicians say, universals—that is, infinities. And in this sphere also it is impossible to *set any limit* to the number and variety of things cognizable by them. It is true that these are not *real* infinities—they are only infinities within certain limits; they are at the utmost only traces of infinity. But it is none the less certain that the human intellect, basing itself on these traces, can rise to the conception of a Perfect Mind, not subjected, as we are, to any conditions. Such a mind would be simply infinite, the Infinite One.

But we are not concerned to discuss this point further at the present moment. Our present business is with the Hamiltonian principle that the human mind is so constituted as to be able to know only the finite. It is a principle which is not peculiar to the Hamiltonian system; for, as we have seen, both the empirical and Kantian systems exclude the Divine wholly from human knowledge. And, indeed, apart altogether from philosophy, there is and ever has been a feeling of a gulf separating the Divine from the human, and that God is high above the reach of our thought. But it is as a Hamiltonian principle that we have here to consider it. Mr. Powell accepts the principle from Dr. Mansel, as Dr. Mansel had accepted it from Sir W. Hamilton. That we are not by this doing an injustice to Mr. Powell is clear from the fact that he habitually speaks of the 'structure' of the human mind, and, indeed, specifically states that our minds are so constituted as to be able to know only the finite. Let

us therefore see how the principle comes out as manipulated by Dr. Mansel. He accepts fully the Kantian position that the Divine lies wholly outside the sphere of our knowledge ; but it is only just to him to say that he lays a greater emphasis than Kant did on the principle of faith. He held that, though *knowledge* cannot reach to the Divine, yet *faith* can ; and it can also give us a practical assurance of the Divine existence. But this exclusion of the Divine from our knowledge—a principle which he carried to its extreme limit in his famous *Bampton Lectures*—has obviously this effect, that it creates an impassable gulf between the Divine and the human generally, and more especially between the Divine Omniscience and human knowledge.

Now let us see, in the first place, how this will affect the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is plain that it introduces into the life of the Incarnate One a state of utter discord, for there exist in Him two natures separated by an impassable gulf, and bridged over solely by His Person. But, as we have said, it is in the sphere of His knowledge that this gulf of separation appears in all its wideness. In regard to His other Divine attributes—His Omnipotence, for instance—it is conceivable that they might have remained quiescent during His earthly life. It is altogether different with His Omniscience. It is inconceivable that that attribute could be laid aside, or could be other than a permanent possession. Hence during His earthly life, the two kinds of knowledge, the Divine and human, are present and active, but wholly separate. They belong to different spheres, and there is no point of contact between the two. It is plain that the doctrine of the Incarnation is subverted by this view ; for, according to it, no real union of the Divine and human has taken place. This idea of the incompatibility of the Divine and human, though intensified by Dr. Mansel's teaching, is not indeed peculiar to it. It has been widely felt at all times as affecting the Incarnation, and men have variously tried to solve it. The simplest solution of all has been the Socinian, which is a denial of the Incarnation. A less violent solution was Nestorianism, which, feeling the impossibility of a real union, gave to the human nature a separate personality. Last of all, we have the Kenotic theory, which, clinging to a real Incarnation, yet satisfies the supposed incompatibility by excluding from the Incarnate One everything divine except His Person.

We do not for a moment attribute to Mr. Powell any of these views, or any sympathy with them. But, having taken

Dr. Mansel as his master in philosophy, he could hardly altogether escape his influence; and he will forgive us if we point to what we take to be traces of it. In regard to our Lord's knowledge he uses the ominous word 'communicated,' meaning thereby that particulars out of His Divine Omniscience were communicated to His human soul; and he even goes so far as to intimate that there were periods in the Incarnate life when this took place. We shall have occasion to consider the point presently. In the meantime, we only mention it to show that in his idea the human knowledge of our Lord formed as it were a closed circle standing altogether apart from the Divine Omniscience. It is a position against which we had occasion to protest in a previous article,¹ when we pointed out how perilously near it is to Nestorianism.

We have already considered the supposed inability of the human mind to rise to the knowledge of the infinite; let us add a word on this gulf which is supposed to separate the Divine from the human. It is clear that it is against the mind of the Church. The Church, while maintaining the distinction between the two natures, and denying any confusion of the one with the other, yet holds that they come together in the Person of the Son with perfect harmony as mutually adapted to each other. Thus, take the Athanasian Creed: 'For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.' The human soul as an entity is perfectly distinct from the body. It is of a different nature and belongs to a different sphere of being; and yet the two meet harmoniously to constitute 'one man.' And so it is with the Divine and human natures. Meeting together harmoniously, they constitute 'one Christ.' We might illustrate this by many analogies, but one will suffice. Take the case of Creation. It is certain that the universe is the creation of a mind which was both infinite and finite. Or, perhaps it might be more correct to say, the universe was the creation of an infinite mind, which, in the act of creating, descended to the finite. For the universe, viewed as a creation or product, is finite throughout, and all its details are finite; and yet it is the creation of an infinite mind. This shows that the Infinite Mind in the act of creating must have descended to the finite, producing and arranging details which are cognizable by the human mind. Perhaps we shall understand it better if we compare Divine with human creation. The human mind also can create. An engineer, for instance, can create a

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1891, 'Our Lord's Knowledge as Man.'

great engineering work, an architect a grand building, a poet a great poem, and a painter or sculptor a beautiful work of art. But the human mind in creating is limited to merely thinking out the details of its creation. It cannot give objective existence to its creation. If it wishes to realize its creation objectively, it must make use of the materials and forces of nature. The Divine Mind, on the other hand, by the very act of *thinking out* (the expression is inappropriate, but we have no other) the details, gives objective existence to its creation. The Divine creation is perfect creation. But the point for us to notice is that the Omniscient Mind of God in creating terminates in the production of a finite universe cognizable by the human mind. In creation, therefore, Omniscient knowledge and a knowledge on the same plane as human knowledge meet together in perfect harmony.

We are told in Scripture that the Creation was effected by and through the Word. It was in His Person, therefore, that the Omniscient Mind descended to the finite, without, of course, parting with its Omniscience, but rather continuing to know both omnisciently and finitely. And in His Person it must have continued to know and act both omnisciently and finitely in the providential ordering of the world. We thus see that the Incarnation was already at the Creation half effected. It wanted only that the Divine Word should enter *really* into human life by assuming in the fulness of time His human nature.

We have next, in the second place, to consider the effect of the Hamiltonian principle, that the human mind is so constituted as to be able to know only the finite, upon the doctrine of a future life. We have, indeed, already considered this in reference to the almost identical Kantian principle, and we need not repeat what we have said. But the Christian doctrine of the future extends far beyond the mere survival of our personality at the moment of death. It is rather the doctrine of a higher life—a life immensely in advance of our present life. It is necessary, therefore, to look at the principle in reference to this wider prospect.

In order to bring out the point, we may be permitted to refer to what we said in a previous article on our Lord's knowledge as man. In that article we had occasion to point out the limitation and imperfection of human knowledge in contrast with the Divine. And in doing so we were careful to base that limitation *solely* on the conditions of our present material existence. Human knowledge as it exists at present is, in the first place, sense knowledge, all the knowledge we

have
being
current
is, I
we
view
enc
tha
In
a p
anc
the
per
uns
or e
can
in i
is h
mer
only
in t
exc
han
con
free
way
it is
of t
mus
It is
we
take
alto
befo
dog
shal
kno
con
to c
the
Vis
at f
Pau
the

have of the universe coming to us through the senses. That being so, it follows, in the second place, that it must be discursive; and in the third place, that it must be superficial—that is, limited to the outside or appearances of things. Why did we so base the limitation of human knowledge? It was in view of the Kantian and Hamiltonian principle, and its influence on the doctrine of a future life. Let us recall to mind that principle, and how it influences the hope of a future life. In the Kantian system the human mind is tied down by *a priori* laws; it is compelled to know things only in accordance with these laws; and in carrying out these laws it *creates* the present phenomenal world. It is clear, therefore, if our personality survives the shock of death and passes into the unseen, it must carry the present phenomenal world with it, or else create a new one in all points like the present. It cannot possibly, *in consequence of these a priori laws which lie in its very essence*, rise to a higher state. The principle, as it is held in the Hamiltonian system, does not go so far. It merely holds that our minds are so constituted as to know only the finite. But, inasmuch as this constitution lies also in their essence, it is clear that the Hamiltonian system also excludes the idea of a higher life in the future. On the other hand, if we base the limitation of our knowledge solely on the conditions of our present material existence, leaving the mind free and unfettered as a knowing power, we do not in any way contract the possibilities of the future. How necessary it is, in view of belief in a future life, to preserve this freedom of the mind, will be seen if we consider the revolution that must take place in human knowledge at the moment of death. It is clear that our present knowledge of the universe which we have by the senses will then come to an end. What will take its place? We know not. It may be that a new and altogether different aspect of the universe will be opened out before us. But on such a theme it is useless, even foolish, to dogmatize. The only thing we know for certain is, that we shall carry with us behind the veil the same free intellect or knowing power which we possess here; and that will form the connecting link between the present life and that which is to come.

But it is as bearing on what we are told in Scripture of the future, more especially what we are told of the Beatific Vision, that the Kantian and Hamiltonian systems are most at fault. They seem to make that Vision impossible. St. Paul indicates the wonderful elevation of the future life above the present, when He says of Christ that He 'shall change

our vile body that it may be like unto His glorious body.'¹ St. John also speaks of the same elevation, and also directly promises the Beatific Vision, when he says, 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.'² In regard to the Beatific Vision St. Paul is even more definite than St. John. He says, 'For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.'³ Here it would seem we are promised not only a vision of the glorified Christ, but also in some way of the Triune God. But how is that possible, if our minds are structured and tied down to a knowledge only of the finite? But if, on the other hand, our minds are free—if even now the *intellectual* knowledge which we have of the Infinite and Perfect One is a far clearer knowledge than the knowledge we have of any material object which we can see and handle and pull to pieces—the case is altogether different. We can see how, when freed from present material conditions and elevated to a higher state, we might have the vision of the Infinite God. Even then, however, our vision of Him may not be perfect. Had not St. Paul actually said it, we could hardly have presumed to think of our knowing even as we are known. The utmost point to which we could have presumed to go would have been a partial knowledge of the Infinite One. Descartes has an admirable illustration of how this might be. He supposes a man standing on the shore looking out towards the horizon. He knows that what lies before him is the ocean. He also knows a great deal about the ocean; but he cannot sound its depth. He cannot know the vast, the almost infinite, variety of things contained in it. So it may be in the Beatific Vision. We may know God as He is; we may know far more about Him than we know at present. We may know also that we are in His very presence, and with the Psalmist be ready to cry out, 'In Thy Presence is the fulness of joy'; and yet even then the depths of His infinity may be hidden from us.

Before passing from the philosophical standpoint we may make a few remarks on the picture we form in our minds of our Lord's Incarnate Being, more especially as respects the relation between His Divine and human knowledge. This may seem quite a subordinate point; but in reality it is not so. It will have a great influence on our ultimate conclusions; and if we form a wrong picture, it may lead us very far astray. Mr. Powell, in giving his rendering of human know-

¹ Phil. iii. 21.² 1 John iii. 2.³ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

ledge, bestows almost exclusive attention on 'consciousness.' This is very natural, following as he does in the steps of Dr. Mansel. His book, for instance, in its subordinate title is 'The relation between our Lord's Divine Omniscience and His human consciousness'; and we do not observe that in treating of the matter he ever goes beyond consciousness. In reality, however, the empirical or waking consciousness covers but a small part of human knowledge. The waking consciousness is merely the light in which the mind acquires or manipulates its knowledge. Behind the waking consciousness there is the sphere of memory, with its vast store of acquired knowledge. It is of great importance that we should take this into account in forming our mental picture of our Lord's Incarnate Being, because it gives us a ground on which, if we take our stand, we shall be able to form some notion of the relation in which the Divine Omniscience stood to His human knowledge. Taking our stand therefore on this, we arrive at this result: In every human being there is, lying behind the waking consciousness, the sphere of memory or of acquired knowledge. It is a vast sphere, the depths of which no one has ever yet sounded. There are in it things of which we have not the remotest conception—things which, when by some chance they come up into consciousness, often excite our astonishment. We may suppose that all or most of them were once in consciousness, and that they have now passed out and remain hidden in the memory, where they remain unnoticed by us, but, as we shall see, not without influence. Now, applying this to the case of our Lord, we see that in forming our picture of His Incarnate Being we must suppose that, behind His waking consciousness, He had, as all men have, this vast sphere of human memory. But his Incarnate Being did not end there. In Him there was another depth of even vaster dimensions—a depth stretching far away into infinity—the whole volume of His Divine Omniscience.

But let us look again a little more closely at this vast sphere of memory. It may lead us to important conclusions. Let us first ask, in what *form* does our knowledge lie in the memory? Clearly it does not possess any form; it lies in a state of solution, so to speak. But though without form it is not without some definiteness, some kind of particularity; for we have, up to a certain point, power over these stores lying in the memory. We can extract at will particulars from them. Lastly, there is a point of great moment in the present connexion. Our knowledge as it exists in the memory is perfectly formless; but in the very act of re-

miniscence—that is, the act of extracting particulars from it—we give it form, the form which knowledge existing in consciousness usually takes. Now apply this to the case of our Blessed Lord. He had, of course, as we have, the same power of extracting particulars from memory. But as we have seen, He had lying behind His consciousness not only His human memory but the infinitely greater sphere of the Divine Omniscience. What can we say of it? Of the knowledge embraced in it we are not entitled to say that it was formless; we are not, in fact, entitled to say anything regarding it; for it lies quite beyond our knowledge. But we may say thus much. Just as He could extract particulars from the sphere of memory, so also He could extract from His Divine Omniscience; and, what is noteworthy, in the very act of extracting He would *translate* or give to these particulars a human form. We submit that the picture thus drawn of our Lord's Incarnate life corresponds in all respects to the picture drawn of Him in the Gospels. According to that narrative, He did draw from His Divine Omniscience particulars which He used in His daily life. The case of Nathanael, for instance, or of the stater, or of the man bearing the pitcher of water, or His reading the thoughts and intents of the heart. It is probable that these instances recorded are merely selections from a greater number of cases. In any case He did convey to His disciples the impression of His being Omniscient. St. Peter exclaims, 'Lord, Thou knowest all things,'¹ and the Epistle to the Hebrews states dogmatically, 'All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with Whom we have to do.'²

But there is a further point very important to be observed. In the case of us men the vast store of acquired knowledge lying in the memory, even when not consciously extracted, yet exercises an all-powerful influence in shaping our thoughts and determining our judgments about things. In a former article,³ in dealing with the question of our Lord's innerness in human matters, we had occasion to signalize this. We gave as an instance two individuals contemplating the same object—say a meteor in the sky—the one an unlettered peasant, the other a scientific adept. The judgment which the former would have of the matter would probably be all wrong, while the other would form a correct judgment in accordance with science. And yet the latter in forming his judgment would not consciously extract from his memory all

¹ St. John xxi. 17.² Heb. iv. 12.³ *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1893, Art. I.

the particulars he had learned about meteors. But this is the important point. The knowledge was there. It was stored in the memory ; and being there, it influenced, necessarily influenced, his mind to form a correct judgment. Now in the case of our Blessed Lord, He had not only in common with us the stores of memory, but He had continually present, as being inseparable from His Person, the whole volume of the Divine Omniscience. How could that be present without influence ? Clearly it must have influenced—silently influenced, so to speak—every judgment which He formed as man. If we think of this fact, and give it due weight, we shall see how inconceivable it is that He could ever have gone wrong. We are told that He was influenced by the age in which He lived ; but surely we have here an influence vastly greater than any influence that could proceed from the age. We need not, it is true, think that the Divine Omniscience was consciously brought into play ; but in common with His memory it lay behind His consciousness, and silently influenced all His judgments.

In this connexion we may notice that expression used by Mr. Powell to which we have already referred. He speaks of knowledge being 'communicated' to our Lord's human mind, and he thinks it was communicated at certain periods of His earthly life. It is an expression which grates sadly on our mind ; and we think it betrays an imperfect appreciation of the hypostatic union, our Lord's human soul could possess no knowledge whatever apart from His Divine Person. Knowledge can only reside in the personality, and His human soul possessed no individuality—no personality whatever. It is forgotten that what the Son of God took was not a human being—that is, an entity having an existence in itself. He took human *nature*, a nature in all respects the same as ours, sin only excepted—in a word, our nature. And in taking it He gave it personality and existence ; He gave it His own Personality. He took human nature in order that entering into the stream of humanity, He might be able to think, speak, and act as man, and thereby rescue us from destruction. Hence every thought which passed through His human mind, every word which proceeded from His mouth, every act which He did as man, was the thought, the word, the act of Himself, the Son of God. To say that knowledge was communicated to His human soul is the same thing as to say that He communicated knowledge to Himself. This tendency to regard the humanity of our Lord as standing apart from His Divine Being is the great danger of the age. How could He have

redeemed, purified, elevated human nature if His earthly life was something apart from His Divine life.

We have taken up so much of our space with the consideration of the philosophical aspect of the question, which we considered the most important at the present time, that we have little left in which to do justice to Mr. Powell's theological treatment of the question. This we very much regret, and we can only hope that those of our readers who are interested in the subject will themselves peruse what Mr. Powell has written. From a theological point of view we think his work is admirably arranged and treated. Mr. Powell, in commencing with his second book, is careful to place in the forefront the two crucial points in the Incarnate work of our Lord—viz. Revelation and Redemption. Our Lord came to impart to mankind a perfect Revelation, and He also came to redeem us. Surely it is from losing sight of these, the two great ends of the Incarnation, that the modern views as to Kenosis have arisen. It is clear that on the Kenotic theory Revelation disappears altogether. The Gospel is not a voice from Heaven, but a voice from Judæa, as Judæa was nineteen hundred years ago; so also the Precious Death loses its value as an atoning Sacrifice, and descends to the level of an example. We would earnestly commend this aspect of the question to many, who without due thought of consequences have adopted these views. Mr. Powell, after devoting a chapter to the consideration of these points, proceeds in his next or second chapter to a closer consideration of the Kenotic theory; and in the course of it he gives a most admirable exposition of the chief passage in dispute (Phil. ii. 7). He first compares the whole passage with the remarkable statement as to our Lord in Heb. i. 1-3; then he gives a careful exegesis of the passage; and lastly completes his account of it by giving a comprehensive sketch of the views of the chief commentators—Greek, Latin, and modern. In the third chapter we have a history of opinion in regard to quiescence, restraint, kenosis and various views tending in that direction. The chapter is divided into three sections: the first traces the history downwards from St. Ignatius to the Reformation; the second from the Reformation to the end of the eighteenth century; and the third deals with the theories of the nineteenth century. There is much in this chapter that is deeply interesting, and had we had space, it would have been a great pleasure to comment upon it.

Mr. Powell passes in his third book to the consideration of the evidence of the Gospels. It is in this book that

Mr. Powell is at his best. In the first chapter he deals with the evidence of the Gospels as to our Lord's knowledge of God. We should have liked much to dwell upon this chapter, for there is much in it which is very striking; much, too, which has for the first time been brought out. We can, however, do no more than indicate its contents. He gives inductively a great array of passages, and then points out how our Lord's knowledge of God is there described as surpassing that which is possible to man. It is also described as being commensurate with that which the Father has. Lastly, it is shown how our Lord claims that His Revelation should be received on account of the Divine character of His knowledge. In the second chapter he passes on to the consideration of our Lord's knowledge of man. In this he distinguishes between our Lord's knowledge and the natural gift of reading character, as well as instances of supernatural insight, such as those vouchsafed to Elijah and St. Peter. He shows in the case of our Lord's knowledge its universality and completeness, and he points out how it must have proceeded from His Omniscience. In the third chapter he passes on to our Lord's knowledge of facts and events. This is a chapter in which he deals critically with objections from the other side in regard to passages which are alleged as showing 'ignorance.' We think he is quite successful, and his victory is assured by his calling attention to the abundant evidence we otherwise have of our Lord's perfect knowledge. In doing this he passes in review our Lord's prediction of the details of His Passion. It is one of the most remarkable points of the Gospel history, and it is impossible on any reasonable critical grounds to eliminate it from the narrative. Besides this great event, our author brings forward also the instances of Nathanael, the stater, the colt tied, and the man bearing the pitcher of water. In the end of the chapter he deals with our Lord's knowledge of the past and of the future.

Two other chapters complete the work. The one deals with the constantly quoted passage, 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man,' &c. His treatment of this point is very good, as is also the concluding chapter on our Lord's knowledge of the Old Testament.

In taking leave of Mr. Powell, the only thing we would wish is that he might reconsider his position in regard to the hypostatic union. As we have indicated, we hold it to be essential to the Catholic faith that we should believe that every thought which passed through our Lord's human mind, every word which proceeded from His mouth, every act of

His life, was the thought, the word, the act of Himself, the Son of God. It may seem to some as if such a view would make the Divinity completely overshadow the humanity, and as a consequence render His temptations and His obedience unto death unreal. In reality, however, it is not so, for here the doctrine of quiescence comes in. In the rendering we have given of human knowledge, it has come out that even in our own case a large part of our knowledge is quiescent. The stores of knowledge laid up in the memory, though constantly present, and constantly influencing our thoughts and our judgments, yet for the most part do not come into consciousness. They form a background, an immense store from which at all times we may draw. It is remarkable, too, that in moments of intense interest, or in the agony of mental or bodily suffering, the consciousness of the moment completely overshadows and excludes the background. We know not how far this analogy may be applicable to our Lord's Omniscience. It might be dangerous to press it, or even to regard it as applicable. But at least we may be sure of this—that, having taken our nature with the view of carrying it through temptation and perfecting its obedience, the purpose He had in view was carried out truly and wholly. It is remarkable that our Lord in the agony of the Cross fed His human soul on passages from the Psalms; and in the gathering darkness and the last extremity He gave utterance to the opening words of the twenty-second Psalm, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' Was He at that moment completely absorbed, so to speak, in His humanity? It is a great mystery; but it is suitable rather for devout contemplation than for theological study.

ART. II.—MR. GLADSTONE'S 'LATER GLEANINGS.'

Later Gleanings—Theological and Ecclesiastical. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. (London, 1897.)

THE issue of a new volume of Mr. Gladstone's *Gleanings of Past Years* will be welcomed by many who are not usually readers of theology. This, the eighth, volume in the series is devoted to theological and ecclesiastical topics. The first chapter of Genesis, considered in the light of the discoveries of physical science, is the subject of the first two papers. The next two are a defence of the Christian Faith against a pair of writers most unlike in their method and temper, Mrs.

Humphry Ward and Colonel Ingersoll. Then follows a trilogy devoted to the Reformation 'Settlement.' A discussion of the miracle worked among the Gadarenes comes next. The ninth essay excited some adverse comment from Churchmen when it first appeared three years ago, and is rather oddly named 'The Place of Heresy and Schism in the Modern Christian Church.' The tenth deals with 'True and False Conceptions of the Atonement.' All of these papers, except the reply to Ingersoll, are reprinted from the *Nineteenth Century*. The volume also includes a paper on the Lord's Day, contributed in 1895 to the *Church Monthly*, and a 'General Introduction to Sheppard's *Pictorial Bible*,' a Chicago publication. At the end of all is a 'Soliloquium and Postscript' dealing with Anglican Orders and the Papal See.

It will be seen that Mr. Gladstone handles subjects of the loftiest importance. Yet probably the chief interest of this collection of essays to many readers will reside in the light they may be found to throw on the ever-fresh and still elusive problem of the eminent writer's own mind and governing convictions. Not that Mr. Gladstone gives an uncertain sound when he writes as a divine or when he writes and speaks as a politician. His style, indeed, is periphrastically polite, and the cautious introduction of a 'hedging' clause into almost every sentence lends an appearance of caniness to his method. But no one can doubt that his theological beliefs are those of a sincere and orthodox Christian, just as no one has any doubt about his political views. The problem lies in the union of old-fashioned and pious conservatism, of adherence to historic and mystical Christianity, with ideals of a 'Manchester' and democratic cast; or rather—since the English mind is built in, as it were, water-tight compartments, and it may be too much to expect the same principles which prevail in the region of pure theology to overflow into and pervade that of practical politics—it puzzles us in that sphere where religion and politics obviously overlap, and where, to a man of eager convictions (which may often change) but few intuitions (which abide through life), there present themselves the greatest temptations to Opportunism. Mr. Gladstone's ecclesiastical proclivities, indeed, have often been a secret or avowed trial to his party. His parliamentary actions and alliances, on the other hand, have sometimes imposed a severe strain on the loyalty of his admirers among Churchmen. And yet perhaps those are right who maintain that Mr. Gladstone has never ceased in politics to be a Tory, and who

trace in his Churchmanship from the first a considerable vein of latitudinarianism.

Whatever may be the answer to these speculations, the leisure of the venerable statesman has been employed on the studies contained in this volume in a manner which will command the admiration of all. Nor is there anything in it which is inconsistent with the following remonstrance :

'As I have lived for more than half a century in an atmosphere of contention, my stock of controversial fire has perhaps become abnormally low ; while Professor Huxley, who has been inhabiting the Elysian regions of science, the *edita doctrinâ sapientium templa serena*,¹ may be enjoying all the freshness of an unjaded appetite. Certainly one of the lessons life has taught me is that, where there is known to be a common object, the pursuit of truth, there should also be a studious desire to interpret the adversary in the best sense his words will fairly bear ; to avoid whatever widens the breach ; and to make the most of whatever tends to narrow it. These I hold to be part of the laws of knightly tournament' (pp. 43-4).

This does not prevent him from dealing the antagonists whom he is concerned with in *The Dawn of Creation and of Worship* and in *The Proem to Genesis* some doughty blows. The anti-theological prepossession which at the outset rules belief in the supernatural to be inadmissible, and which 'puts opposing inquirers summarily out of the way as disturbers of the public peace,' is, Mr. Gladstone's remarks, scarcely the token of 'a strictly scientific spirit' (pp. 2, 3). If to match together the Vedas, the Norse legends, and the Egyptian remains is extolled as 'comparative religion,' that peculiarly modern invention, why is a detailed comparison of Genesis with the Homeric poems to be scouted as childish? (p. 7). Professor Max Müller finds solarism in everything, like men who have looked at the sun till they can see nothing else : in *Puss in Boots*, doubtless, and in *The Cow jumped over the Moon*. But while admitting that the solar theory has an important place in solving the problems of the Aryan religions, Mr. Gladstone emphatically affirms, from his life-long study of the Olympian system as built up by Homer, that 'its dominating spirit is intensely human. It is, therefore, of necessity thoroughly anti-elemental' (pp. 75-6). Similarly he claims the correspondence of the latest ethnological science with the narrative of the dispersion and distribution of the human family recorded in the tenth chapter of Genesis. 'As an historical document the chapter stands without a peer among archaic monuments' (p. 377).

¹ Lucretius, ii. 8.

It is the defence of the 'great Chapter' One which is the immediate object of the first two papers already mentioned, and of part of the last in the book. *The Proem to Genesis*

'was long a favourite subject of attack, and defenders came to be somewhat disheartened and intimidated. But there has grown up a conviction that this Chapter is a great fortress of the Scriptures, not an open passage through which they may be advantageously assailed. . . . And at the very outset we ought to cast aside the poor and artificial shelter which some have sought in broadly distinguishing between spiritual matters and matters physical, in which last it is said it was not the design of Scripture to furnish us with an education. Nor is it. But spiritual facts may have a physical side, and facts physical a spiritual side ; nor can a sharp or defensible line be drawn between them. The Ascension, the Resurrection, even the Incarnation of Christ, involved strongly physical elements, and the plea of defence is one fatal to their authority. Even so the announcement of Creation in this great chapter, to mention nothing else, is one of the greatest and most pregnant moral facts in the whole Bible' (p. 379).¹

Not that we may, as it were, boil down the chapter, and, skimming off the spiritual and moral truths, cast the physical statements of the narrative away. There are many who would apply this treatment to the Gospel narrative also, and, while preserving the 'spiritual truths' of resurrection and ascension, discard the miraculous history. Nor if we do the one can we refuse to do the other. If the Bible was not written to teach us physical science, neither was it written to teach us Palestinian history. The purpose of the narrative of Creation was certainly 'not to rear cosmic philosophers, but to furnish ordinary, and especially primitive, men with some idea of what the Creator had done in the way of providing for them a home and giving them a place in nature' (p. 9). But when the inspired Writer does this by means of

¹ May we not look on David's psalm, *Domine, Dominus noster*, as describing very beautifully the spiritual meaning of Genesis i. ? 'O Lord our Governour, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world, Thou that hast set Thy glory above the heavens . . . I will consider Thy heavens, even the works of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained. What is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou visitest him ? Thou madest him [a little] lower than the angels, Thou crownedst him with glory and worship. Thou madest him to have dominion of the works of Thy hands, and Thou didst put all things under his feet ; all sheep and oxen, yea and the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air and the fishes of the sea, and whatsoever walketh through the paths of the seas. O Lord, our Governour, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world.'

a series of solemn affirmations, carefully, though not scientifically, worded,¹ concerning the order of the Almighty's creative action, it is surely not open to Christians to push those affirmations lightly on one side. The more closely the words of the narrative are scanned the more wonderful it will appear, as revealing that which man's unaided mind could never have discovered, and confirming, rather than anticipating, that which it was within the reach of human faculties to learn. Professor Huxley, it is true, treats the class of Reconcilers with unmeasured scorn; and Professor Huxley was an unsurpassed authority on questions of physical science. On the other hand, another eminent authority, Professor Dana, wrote on April 16, 1886, 'I agree in all essential points with Mr. Gladstone, and believe that the first chapters of Genesis and Science are in accord' (quoted on p. 39). May it not be that Mr. Huxley, who had studied nature very deeply, had studied the Bible very superficially? What, after all, are the objections to the Biblical narrative of Creation? That it omits the periods of invertebrate life that should come between the creation of Plant life and the creation of Fishes, and also omits the great age of Reptiles, with their antecessors the Amphibia, whose place should be between Fishes and Birds. Mr. Gladstone, however, is no doubt right in thinking that 'what the Mosaic writer had in his mind were the creatures with which Adamic man was conversant' (p. 54), and which were placed under his dominion. Such 'creeping things' as then remained were but a sort of appendage to the mammals. The same is the explanation of the mention only of the later forms of plant life, given to man for food. If, further, it be granted that the periods of creation of the different species overlapped, the only remaining objections to the Biblical cosmogony are those ancient cavils repeated by Dr. Réville, the Hibbert lecturer for 1884, in his *Prolegomena to the History of Religions* (p. 42), as (1) that the heaven is spoken of in Genesis i. 6 as a solid vault (στερέωμα, LXX): whereas the Hebrew word means 'expanse,' which stands in the margin of the Revised Version; (2) that in verse 16 the Biblical cosmogony places the creation of the stars after the formation of the earth: whereas, in fact, nothing is said about 'creation,' the 'making' or appointment of the two great lights, to rule day and night respectively, being followed simply by the words, 'the stars also';² (3) that the grass,

¹ For example, animals are described according to habitat rather than structure.

² Together with sun and moon, these stars are the lights mentioned

herb
diffic
accep
to ha
to ha
envel
there
formi
'creat
is inc
signifi
the h
used
'God
of the
the fir
second
hibits
lower
Mr. G

'If
twenty

in verse
and to
mean th
suffici
their us

¹ M
ποσιὲν th
familiar
express
element
At Isai
πούσας
the crea
γῆς; an
10; Re
or ὁ κτίσ

² In
printing
pages.
last line
... act
p. 412, l
line 19,
line, 'ac
repeated
'Napole
last line

herb, and fruit trees precede the making of the sun—an old difficulty, amply explained, however, by the now usually accepted nebular or rotatory hypothesis, which requires light to have been diffused before it was concentrated, and the sun to have been felt before it was visible through the earth's envelope of vapour. In the Hebrew, if not in the Greek,¹ there is a marked distinction between 'creating' and making, forming or fashioning. When Dr. Réville speaks of the 'creation' of the stars and the 'formation' of the earth, he is incorrect in both cases. The original uses the word 'create' significantly and scientifically. 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth' (verse 1). In verse 21 'create' is used of the beginning of animal life. Thirdly, in verse 27, 'God created man in His own image.' Further, the creation of the visible universe seems to be presented as a whole in the first paragraph (verses 1-5), and then distributively in the second paragraph (verses 6-19). The entire narrative exhibits an orderly progression from chaos to cosmos, from lower to higher, from simple to complex, divided into stages. Mr. Gladstone observes:

'If we hold that the days of the great chapter are not periods of twenty-four hours, but great chapters² of action, capable of over-

in verse 14 as set in the firmament to divide the day from the night, and to be for signs and for seasons and for days and years, and probably mean the planets, which could only become spherically luminous when a sufficient quantity of light-force was accumulated on or in the sun. But their use for the service of man is subordinate and partial.

¹ Mr. Gladstone observes that the reason why the Septuagint uses *ποιεῖν* throughout is probably that the idea of creation proper was not familiar to the Greeks, and their language contained no better word to express it (p. 10). But most commonly elsewhere *κρίζειν* is used of elemental creation, as at Psalm cxlviii. 5, αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν. At Isaiah xlv. 7 three words are used: Ἐγὼ ὁ κατασκευάσας φῶς καὶ ποιήσας σκότος, ὁ ποίῶν εἰρήνην καὶ κρίζω κακὰ. *Κρίζειν* is especially used of the creation of Man, as at Deut. iv. 32, ἐκτίσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; and in the New Testament it is the proper word: see Col. i. 16, iii. 10; Rev. iv. 11, x. 6, &c. So 'the Creator' is ὁ κτίστης (1 Peter iv. 19) or ὁ κτίσας (Eccl. xii. 1; Rom. i. 25).

² In this and a few other places there are slips of expression or of printing, venial if the venerable author, as is probable, corrects his own pages. 'Great chapter' is here repeated in a different sense. On p. 411, last line, 'the reliance which the loyal Roman Catholic places upon the . . . action of His Church' should be 'his Church'; and so again on p. 412, line 3. On p. 55, n. 1, the bracket is closed too soon. On p. 68, line 19, 'unfolding' should perhaps be 'enfolding,' and on p. 104, last line, 'admit' should be 'submit.' On p. 116, line 8, 'in many cases' is repeated just afterwards. On p. 144, line 19, for 'Code Napoleon' read 'Napoléon'; on p. 219, line 5, for 'dauble' read 'double,' and on p. 298, last line but three, 'they' is required before 'may.'

lapping, rather than mere time, this is not a denial that the several stages might have been accomplished in any number of our chronic hours, however small, had it pleased the Almighty Father' (p. 383).

In somewhat the same way Sir Thomas Browne, while fantastically declaring that time 'is but five days elder than ourselves,'¹ says elsewhere :

'Some believe there went not a minute to the World's creation, nor shall there go to its destruction ; those six days, so punctually described, make not to them one moment, but rather seem to manifest the method and Idea of the great work of the intellect of God than the manner how He proceeded in its operation.'²

But we must pass on to Mr. Gladstone's handling of *Robert Elsmere*, the most noted of the new style of 'propagandist romances.' A hundred years ago fiction was employed by a gifted woman, Maria Edgeworth, to convey eternal truths under the guise of Moral Tales. The doctrines of the High Church revival were conveyed into thousands of pure homes through the refined and wholesome genius of Miss Yonge, still happily doing her beneficent work. More recently the novel has been used by lady writers, more or less gifted, to inculcate Broad-Churchism, positivism, agnosticism, and that substitute for the Gospel of the Redeemer which is styled the Service of Man. Mrs. Humphry Ward's mistake, as an artist and a controversialist, is to set up a man of straw, a clergyman whose religion has rested 'on the poetical and dramatic instincts of a passionate nature,'³ to be easily knocked over by the hackneyed arguments against Christianity of a sceptical squire. Mr. Gladstone says :

'The one side is a pæan, and the other a blank. A great creed, with the testimony of eighteen centuries at its back, cannot find an articulate word to say in its defence' (p. 83).

Dr. Johnson, we know, in his imaginary reports of the Parliamentary debates 'took care not to let the Whig dogs have the best of it'; but his friends considered he had shown great impartiality.⁴ Macaulay, too, in the 'Conversation between Mr. Abraham Cowley and Mr. John Milton touching the Great Civil War,'⁵ contrives that the cavalier disputant shall be defeated, but is too skilful a rhetorician not to keep up the interest on both sides. But in Mrs. Ward's novel supernatural Christianity goes down at a touch. Mr. Glad-

¹ *Religio Medici* (Macmillan, 1881), p. 20.

² *Ibid.* p. 72.

³ *Robert Elsmere*, i. 121, 123.

⁴ *Johnson*, by Leslie Stephen, p. 28.

⁵ *Miscellaneous Writings*, p. 45.

sto
in w
from
a W

merc
by th
less
(p. 9

But
leav
betw
Cros
quite
gion
relig
emot
terril
the s
long
hood
and t
a me
case.

'T
schem
feet, i

To l
Rede
stone

'from
then,
satisf
wind.
moder
peacoc
cannot

TI
a ref
of Pro
many
instinc
redem
to be

stone gives some pages to the discussion of Miracles, disbelief in which, indeed, comes rather from the set of the mind than from the reason, where there is still belief in the existence of a Will above ourselves.

'The multiplication of enjoyments, through the progress of commerce and invention, enhances the materialism of life, strengthens by the forces of habit the hold of the seen world upon us, and leaves less both of brain power and of heart power available for the unseen' (p. 99).

But he shows that the excision of the miraculous element still leaves large portions of the sacred story—all, for instance, between the Procession of Palms and the Death on the Cross—and many features of the New Testament system, quite irreconcilable with a merely human Christ. Every religion which believes in God is dogmatic, and undogmatic religion would be fiction volatilized into feeling, irrational emotion built upon nothing in the way of fact. There is a terrible disease that takes the form of a softening of the bones, the skeleton and the framework of the body, which can no longer hold itself and its members upright. A New Brotherhood religion which, by rejecting the doctrine of the God-Man and the system of sacramental grace, resolves fraternity into a mere sentiment, helpless to explain itself, is in the same case.

'The chasm between deity and the human soul, over which the scheme of Redemption has thrown a bridge, again yawns beneath our feet, in all its breadth and depth' (p. 101).

To banish the supernatural idea and character of the Redeemer, while adopting His moral teachings, is, Mr. Gladstone says,

'from my antiquated point of view, simply to bark the tree, and then, as the death which ensues is not immediate, to point out with satisfaction on the instant that it still waves living branches in the wind. We have before us a huge larcenous appropriation, by the modern schemes, of goods which do not belong to them. They carry peacock's feathers, which adorn them for a time, and which they cannot reproduce' (p. 107).

These Elgood Street brotherhoods aim, it would seem, at a reformed rather than a regenerated world. Their ideals of Progress are not only defective, one-sided, and lacking in many of the nobler and more poetic elements of life, but the instincts and aspirations of the natural man, needing neither redemption, nor new birth, nor discipline and correction, are to be its starting point. The temper of our age is Pelagian.

'There is one feature which almost uniformly marks writers whose mind, as in this case, is of a religious tone, or who do not absolutely exclude religion, while they reject the Christian dogma and the authority of Scripture. They appear to have a very low estimate both of the quantity and quality of sin : of its amount, spread like a deluge over the world, and of the subtlety, intensity, and virulence of its nature' (p. 114). '... I for one do believe that in many cases the reason why the doctrines of grace, so profoundly embedded in the Gospel, are dispensed with by the negative writers of the day, is in many cases because they have not fully had to feel the need of them : because they have not travelled with St. Paul through the dark valley of agonizing conflict, or with Dante along the circles downward and the hill upward ; because, having to bear a smaller share than others of the common curse and burden, they stagger and falter less beneath their weight' (p. 116).

In his transatlantic antagonist Mr. Gladstone has to meet an assailant of Christianity of a coarser and more thorough-going school. The discussion turns on such well-worn topics, springing up like again and again demolished nettles, as the slaying by Jephthah of his daughter, the command to Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, Darwinianism, the sufferings here of the good, the injustice of punishing men hereafter for their religious opinions. On the last point Mr. Gladstone has some excellent observations, which strike at the root of a dogma of ecclesiastical Liberalism. That belief is independent of the will is shown to be 'a plausibility of the shallowest kind' (p. 152). Even a boy who brings out his sum wrong has probably been careless, or has not attended at some previous time to his teachers, and so is rightly punished. Worthy people who publish treatises proving the quadrature of the circle usually show some signs of egotism or ambition. But much more in the region of moral and religious opinion are bias, prejudice, laziness, stubbornness, conceit, and pride likely to enter. Is it conceivable that a man's conclusions, say in politics, shall not be influenced by passions and motives that can be controlled, by love and patriotism, by self-interest and prepossession? 'You will admit,' says Colonel Ingersoll, 'that he who now persecutes for opinion's sake is infamous.'¹ Again, he describes 'the dogma of eternal pain' as 'that infamy of infamies.'² Accordingly, anyone who has ever sincerely believed in eternal pain, or in the duty of saving from it men who are in error by afflicting their bodies (the early Puritan settlers in New England, for instance), is infamous. And yet opinion, he tells the public, is independent

¹ Reply to Dr. Field, *North American Review*, No. 372, p. 477.

² Letter to Dr. Field, *North American Review*, vol. cxlvi. p. 33.

of the will, and men are in no way responsible for their beliefs. Did not Thuggism honestly believe murder to be innocent? Colonel Ingersoll's own conclusions in those deep and difficult matters where it is a duty to 'keep steady the ever-quivering balance of our faculty of judgment' are utterly reckless. As his critic says, he 'chooses to ride an unbroken horse and to throw the reins upon his neck' (p. 158). On such a steed he might be supposed to have 'galloped not through, but about, the sacred volume, much as a man lightly glances over the pages of an ordinary newspaper or novel' (p. 124)—that volume which

'has been to many and justly famous men a study "never ending, still beginning" . . . opening height on height and with deep answering to deep, and with increase of fruit ever prescribing increase of effort' (p. 144).

The eloquent American

'has sounded all these depths, has found them very shallow, and is quite able to point out¹ the way in which the Saviour of the world might have been a much greater teacher than He actually was; had He said anything, for instance, of the family relation, had He spoken against slavery and tyranny, had he issued a sort of *code Napoléon* embracing education, progress, scientific truth and international law.'²

In the three papers on the Reformation period we turn to a different vein of interest. The 'great national to-and-fro of the sixteenth century,' the swaying of Church and nation first this way and then that under four successive rulers, was due to the near balance of parties; and it was not till the seventeenth century that 'the consciences of the country came to a settlement of their accounts with one another' (p. 160), the previous movement having been rather one of nationalism. The Church became under Laud a 'vast and definite force'; but Mr. Gladstone thinks it necessary to echo the old misleading Whig phrases about 'close alliance with despotism,' whereby 'in retribution for its sins it shared the ruin of arbitrary power' (p. 161). It was surely the Church that pulled the Monarchy down, more than the Monarchy the Church; and, had Charles I. saved his life and the name of king by abandoning his spiritual Mother, the Throne might have stood, but the Church, as an apostolic institution, would have been mercilessly suppressed. Whether Authority is from above or from below was the issue that had somehow to be fought out both in Church and State. Turning to Puritanism, Mr. Glad-

¹ Reply to Dr. Field, p. 490.

² *Ibid.*

stone speaks of it as a 'partner ejected from the firm' in 1662 (p. 162). It was truly rather a new firm trading under the old name. At that time 'a small numerical minority of the country, but with more than a proportionate share both of its distinguished theologians and of its religious life'—can Mr. Gladstone really place Baxter and his associates so high in the great Caroline age?—Puritanism has now become 'a solid, inexorable fact of religious history' (pp. 162, 163). It represents an 'essential requisite of the national character' (p. 216).¹ Yet Puritanism was at first an imported article and not native-born. Mr. Gladstone shows with much lucidity that the Reformation changes were not manufactured for the Church, or against the Church, by the civil power, but were her own act. A basis of ecclesiastical legality for these changes was laid, not by the persons popularly known as the Reformers, but in the sanction, earlier than the rupture with Rome, of the collective national episcopate, including such names as Warham, Tunstal, Gardiner, and Fisher. The King thought the synodical action of the Convocations so essential that he pressed for it with tenacious eagerness. But the pressure which Henry exercised to procure, in 1531, the recognition of the Sovereign as 'quantum per legem Christi licet supremum caput' cannot justly, Mr. Gladstone considers, be called terrorism (pp. 171, 236). In 1534 both of the as yet unpacked Convocations—York *unanimiter* and Canterbury with but five dissentients—agreed that the Bishop of Rome by the sacred Scriptures has no greater jurisdiction in the realm of England than any other foreign bishop. Our Church has never denied the primatial and patriarchal pre-eminence of the see of Rome, and could not do so while appealing to antiquity. But a Divine and Scriptural right of ordinary jurisdiction outside Italy had, in the earlier stage of the Reformation, few defenders in any quarter. At the same time we feel that in breaking with Rome the men of that age only

¹ 'To Puritanism,' Mr. Gladstone says, 'we owe it that the doctrine of non-resistance, the birth-sin of the English Reformation and the plague-spot of the Church of England, did not undermine and absorb the political liberties of the nation' (p. 216). He would seem to speak here rather as the inheritor of political formulas than as the historical student. For, as was shown in a former number of this *Review* (vol. xlv. April 1897, art. 'Christian Monarchy'), there was no question from Wyclif's time to that of Hobbes and Locke about the sinfulness of resistance to lawful authority, but only as to where that authority resided—whether in pope, king, consistory, or parliament. The original maintainers of the right of resisting and dethroning the king were the Papalists and Jesuits, whose arguments were borrowed by Presbyterian and Parliamentary. Passive obedience was to be transferred to pope, Kirk, or the Houses.

partl
which
the s
left i
T
noth
an at
Tudo
hesit
to re
was
Eliza
had s
by P
At th
entire
reign
in sy
indee
Zwin
How
the b
react
party
furth
const

'T
used
order
'...
the C

Neve
fied,
Restr
in he
are t
perso
berlan
revolu
novat
to it,
featur
'estab
of com

partly perceived the gravity and irretrievableness of the step, which for the first time cut off the Church of England from the sodality and communion of Western Christendom, and left it insular, weak, and at the mercy of the civil power.

The Headship, indeed, was declared on both sides to be nothing new. The province of Canterbury could not create an attribute for the king of the realm (p. 242). None of the Tudor sovereigns exercised the royal supremacy more unhesitatingly than Mary, and whatever was done in her reign to reverse the changes carried out under Henry and Edward was royal and Parliamentary, not synodical. Hence at Elizabeth's accession the pre-Marian acts of the Church itself had still ecclesiastical validity, and only needed the removal by Parliament of legal impediments to revive in full force. At the same time the field was cleared, by death and by the entirely regular deprivation of bishops intruded in the last reign, for the establishment of a legal and canonical episcopate in sympathy with the new order. Too much in sympathy, indeed. The tide was running violently towards a semi-Zwinglian Protestantism, and the bishops went with the tide. How much we owe to Elizabeth for standing almost alone in the breach is clearly brought out in these pages. Putting the reactionary Papists aside, there really was no conservative party to look to for support. Yet she not only stopped the further de-Catholicizing of the Church, but set herself to re-construct. Mr. Gladstone says :

'The singular feature of the Queen's conduct is this, that she used arbitrary power in opposition to the sense of her prelates, in order to maintain the strict law and discipline of the Church' (p. 211). '... She pursued her work from first to last mainly in opposition to the Church's rulers and without a party to support her' (p. 216).

Nevertheless Elizabeth repudiated the title, however modified, of Head of the Church, and, reviving the Act for the Restraint of Appeals, with its famous Preamble, reasserted in her Act of Uniformity the principle that spiritual causes are to be decided by spiritual, or at least duly qualified, persons, rather than by Cromwells, Somersets, and Northumberlands (p. 198). She restored the *congé d'eslire*, shelved the revolutionary *Reformatio Legum*, forbade the Commons to innovate upon the Prayer Book, while procuring the restoration to it, at points chosen with remarkable skill, of some Catholic features. She

'established as her ordinary method of action in Church matters that of communications from herself or her council to the Primate or the

bishops, as the actual chief magistrates of the Church, sometimes in the tone of request, sometimes of injunction' (p. 212),

and put an end to the system of commissions during pleasure. She obtained the formal recognition of the authority of the Church in controversies of faith, as well as of its power to decree rites and ceremonies (Art. xx.), and the enactment that nothing should be declared anew to be heresy except with the assent of the spirituality and the temporality. Her policy was strictly constructive and conservative—namely,

'to build up the Church beneath the shadow of the prerogative, which had been used so largely under Henry and Edward to depress and dishonour it as to threaten depriving it of all capacity to command respect, to train character, or to exercise beneficial influence' (p. 216).

The controversy with Professor Huxley concerning the swine miracle at Gadara is narrowed to the vital point—Were the owners of the swine under the Mosaic law? Mr. Huxley confuses the character of the local civil government, and the wealthy class attached to it, with that of the general population (p. 251). Mr. Gladstone abundantly shows from Josephus and Strabo that Gadara, the 'country of the Gadarenes,'¹ called in St. Luke viii. 37 the 'surrounding country of the Gerasenes,' was from ancient time Jewish, forming part of the old promised land (p. 274). Nor is it probable that our Lord

'should have carried His ministry into a really Greek or Gentile district on the only one occasion when He thought fit to run counter to the public sentiment, and to give His action the character of a serious interference with the rights of property' (p. 976).

This, however, presumes the story to be in its main outline true, whereas Mr. Huxley tears it away from the Synoptist narrative, which yet he considers that it generally discredits. We pass on to the article already mentioned as striking what will seem the 'Broad-Church' note in Mr. Gladstone's ecclesiastical attitude, 'The Place of Heresy and Schism in the Modern Christian Church.' Mr. Gladstone starts with the declaration that Christ our Lord founded the Church as a visible and organized society, apostolically constituted and commissioned (p. 280). What, then, would be

'the condition of any who, acknowledging His authority, should yet rebel against the jurisdiction then solemnly constituted, should sever themselves, in doctrine or in communion, from His servants, and

¹ St. Mark v. 1; St. Luke viii. 26.

shou
there
escap
in th
the C
With
most
who
schis
280,

Mr.
the
(p. 2
from
whic
'hav
and
the
beco
Aria
vidu
theo
East
ceas
the l
And
clash
sitor
shor
Euro
(p. 2
rema
Nest
pres
dura
Gnos
he fo
gene
basis
while

equal
The
of Ca
Chris

should presume in this way to impair their witness and to frustrate thereby His work, so far as in them lay? This question did not escape the forethought of our Saviour, and it was dealt with by Him in the simplest and most decisive manner. "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." With this stringent law the language of the Apostles coincides, and, most markedly perhaps among them all, the language of St. John, who was especially the Apostle of love. The work of heretics and schismatics was a work of the flesh, it excluded from salvation' (pp. 280, 281).

Mr. Gladstone, nevertheless, pleads for 'an alteration in the ancient modes of dealing with' heretics and schismatics (p. 297). The Church is no longer a 'city set on a hill,' confronting a hostile world (p. 281). The elements of evil which at first carried on an open warfare with the Church 'have since the fourth century wrought against her true life and spirit more subtly from within' (p. 282). But, moreover, the evidence pointing out a clear duty of allegiance has become darkened and perplexed. During the agonizing Arian struggle 'what could be the responsibility of the individual Christian for threading his way through the mazes of theological controversy to the truth?' (p. 285). Since then East and West have parted company. The Eastern Church ceased to be homogeneous. In the sixteenth century came the breach of portions of the Western Church with Rome. And out of the loins of that severance sprang the myriad clashing sects. Nor are these last ephemeral, meteoric, transitory. Where there is no blessing from God heresy has been short-lived. But the 'massive Protestantism' of Northern Europe is 'a hard, inexpugnable, intractable, indigestible fact' (p. 287). Mr. Gladstone is here not very consistent. He remarks just before that Churches tainted with Eutychian and Nestorian error have subsisted from the fifth century to the present day (pp. 286, 307).¹ And when he compares the durability of Dissent with the fleeting existence of 'the Gnostic, the Arian, the Donatist, the Monophysite' (p. 287), he forgets that he says himself, in another essay,² that 'many generations passed before Arianism wholly ceased to be the basis of Christian profession in sections of Christendom,' while Donatism (to say nothing of Arianism and Gnosticism)

¹ It is going too far, however, to say that 'they appear to enjoy equally with the Orthodox Church the prerogative of perpetuity' (p. 287). The East Syrians, among whom the mission priests of the Archbishop of Canterbury now work, once outnumbered, it is said, all the rest of Christendom. They are now a remnant of about two hundred thousand.

² That on *Robert Elsmere*, p. 102.

took centuries to extinguish. The oldest of our sects counts but three centuries, and those which date before this reign have only survived by gradually discarding the Calvinism which gave them birth. Dissent will doubtless exist considerably longer as a political force and as a protest against the principle of Authority in religion. It will continue as a force opposing the Church—opposing, that is, the sacerdotal and sacramental aspects of historic Christianity. But as a system of positive, evangelical religion 'inorganic Protestantism' is almost at an end. The rationalistic and down-grade movement finds in it no logical standpoint of resistance. 'Singularly active and progressive' Mr. Gladstone calls it (p. 288). He recalls times when 'it has appeared as if the hands principally charged with the training of souls for God were the hands mainly or only of Nonconformists' (*ibid.*) Such disparagement of old-fashioned Churchmanship is now a somewhat facile commonplace; but, granting it fully true, it supplies the reason why Nonconformity *has* held its own, not why it will do so in the future. Mr. Gladstone, again, could 'but too easily quote the cases in which the Christian side of political controversies has been largely made over by the members of the English Church to the championship of Nonconformists' (*ibid.*) The distinguished statesman is, no doubt, thinking of some of those political controversies with which his own name is connected, though he instances the abolition of negro slavery in 1833 (p. 289). It must be remembered, however, that there are usually two sides from which a Christian may view moral questions. The Nonconformists have been Mr. Gladstone's loyal supporters as regards Greece, as regards 'peace and retrenchment,' as regards the franchise, and generally in those causes which have Philanthropy, Freedom, Democratic Progress, and the like inscribed on their banner.¹ But the opponents of those causes also looked at the question from the point of view of principle. Even as regards slavery Churchmen were not backward (if it be so) because they or their friends owned slaves, but because they feared the disorganization of society and clung to the idea of subordination as its basis. They had their ideal, as the emancipators had theirs. Even the heathen

¹ Not, however, on the Marriage question. We rejoice that Mr. Gladstone reaffirms that our Lord 'taught (according to the widest and, I believe, the best opinion) the absolute indissolubility of marriage' (p. 144). But his familiar doctrine that no bond of union should continue where union of hearts is absent surely strikes at the root of this affirmation. Unfortunately the Nonconformists and Mr. Gladstone come together again on the Wife's Sister Bill.

maste
famil
death

If the
huma
that,
also t
for im
Revo
earne
N
for d
tian l
distr
or a
But M
of Ch
chall
of the
to he
the m

'I
recor
in ch
expla
fellow
will h

His
been
(1) th
modi
taking
Mr.
sophi
coun
putin
the c
of th

14
'built
other
sugge

master or mistress was often an affectionate parent to the *familia* of bondservants. So the trusty slave laments Alcestis' death—

ἀπομύζων ἔμην
δέσποιναν, ἣ' μοὶ πᾶσι τ' οἰκέταυσιν ἦν
μήτηρ κ.τ.λ. (Eurip. *Alcestis*, 768-770.)

If the Nonconformists have sometimes been more zealous for humanitarian causes than Churchmen it must not be forgotten that, just as a man has 'les défauts de ses qualités,' so he has also the qualities of his defects. A general dislike to authority, for instance, will predispose him to champion the oppressed. Revolt from dogmatic and revealed religion may make him earnest on behalf of 'moral' causes.¹

Now the break-up of Christendom is undoubtedly a reason for deeming more hopefully of persons who are leading Christian lives outside the fold of the Apostolic Church, and a great distinction is to be made between the originator of a heresy or a schism and persons brought up in hereditary error. But Mr. Gladstone appears to argue that the existing varieties of Christianity should at last be recognized as a permanent, unchallengeable, and unblamable fact. He is himself fully aware of the gravity of 'extenuating the responsibilities which attach to heresy and schism, and tampering with the securities for the maintenance of the true Apostolic doctrine' (p. 304).

'It may be said that I am playing with edge-tools; that the record of Scripture is plain and strong, written on the sacred page as in characters of fire. Do not, it will be said, attenuate, do not explain away, a teaching which is Divine. You are tempting your fellow-creatures to walk in slippery paths, and if they should fall you will have incurred no small responsibility' (p. 294).

His reply is that the laws of religion have in other cases been 'modified by circumstance' (p. 283). Those cases are (1) the making of graven images, the prohibition of which is modified by the Incarnation, and (2) the Mosaic law against taking interest for money. With the greatest respect for Mr. Gladstone, can this plea be regarded as other than sophistical? Can the Incarnation, which fulfilled God's counsel concerning man, be paralleled with men's sinful disputings, which have thwarted it? Or is a temporary law for the chosen nation to be put on an equality with the prayer of the Redeemer in his last hours, 'Ut omnes unum sint,

¹ 'Non-Anglican Protestantism' is praised (p. 288) in that it has 'built itself steadily upward without aid, generally speaking, from any other than internal and voluntary sources.' What is the invidiously suggested comparison?

sicut tu, Pater, in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint: ut credat mundus quia tu me misisti'?'¹ Mr. Gladstone, indeed, ingeniously reasons that the divisions of Christians are a great proof to the heathen that the Father has sent the Son, because of their 'accordant witness to the truths that our religion is the religion of the God-Man, and that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh' (p. 308)—Pentecost, as it were, amid Babel. In an eloquent passage he compares 'genuine undenominationalism' with 'spurious.' The former is thus described:—

'I do not know on earth a more blessed subject of contemplation than that which I should describe as follows. There are, it may be, upon earth four hundred and fifty million of professing Christians. There is no longer one fold under one visible shepherd. Christ's flock is broken up into scores, it may be hundreds, of sections. These sections are not at peace, but at war. Nowhere are they too loving to one another; for the most part love is hardly visible among them. Each makes it a point to understand his neighbour not in the best sense, but in the worst; and the thunder of anathema is in the air. But they all profess the Gospel. And what is the Gospel? . . . With exceptions so slight that we may justly set them out of the reckoning, the reply is still the same as it was in the Apostolic age, the central truth of the Gospel lies in the Trinity and the Incarnation, in the God that made us and the Saviour that redeemed us. When I consider what human nature and human history have been, and how feeble is the spirit in its warfare with the flesh, I bow my head in amazement before this mighty moral miracle, this marvellous concurrence evolved from the very heart of discord.

'Such, as I apprehend, is the undenominational religion of heaven, of the blissful state. It represents perfected union with Christ and conformity to the will of God. . . . It is the fair fabric now exhibited in its perfection, which could afford to drop, and has dropped, all the scaffolding² supplied by the Divine Architect in His wisdom for the rearing of the structure. . . . Whatever may have been the means, God the Holy Ghost has been the worker. . . . In some cases the auxiliary apparatus was elaborate and rich, in others it was elementary and simple' (pp. 299–301).

The 'spurious undenominationalism' is the establishment by

¹ St. John xvii. 21.

² In the *Proem to Genesis*, p. 72, Mr. Gladstone says, 'It may be that Christianity itself is in some sort a scaffolding, and that the final building is a pure and perfect theism.' He tells us in a note (*ibid.*) that Cardinal Manning and Dr. Hutton both wrote to remonstrate with him on this passage, as 'disparaging to the honour of our Lord's humanity,' but that his intention was simply to conform to 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28. To style the Plan of Redemption a mere scaffolding is surely not only disparaging but untrue.

law of
autho
'man
comm
'tres
invas
viceg
Glad
or M
nomin
degre
terist
princ
weak
Medi
broug
trover
regar
eterna
as me
he hin
he be
anoth
super
falling
resolv
(p. 29
many
fundam
aposta
be Ch
Gladst
schism
may h
organi
424).
we are
Schism
Jerobo

¹ Ye
led by
debates
schools.

² Th
as a se
thought

law of this 'common Christianity' as the exclusive religion authorized in public elementary teaching. This is to 'manipulate the religion of our Lord and Saviour' by 'un-commissioned hands' (p. 302), a 'profane and sacrilegious' 'trespass on the province of the sanctuary' (p. 304)¹ and an invasion of the rights of the private conscience, which is the vicegerent of God (p. 309). It is not clear whether Mr. Gladstone is here attacking his own party and its backbone, or Mr. Riley and the Circular. But to return to that un-denominationalism which Mr. Gladstone finds 'in the highest degree cheering and precious' (p. 299); we fear his characteristic optimism carries him too far. Those who reject the *principle* of sacramentalism and sacerdotalism can have but a weak hold on the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Mediatorial Priesthood. And there are abundant signs, brought out painfully in the London School Board controversy, that 'non-Episcopal Protestants' are ceasing to regard the Trinity itself as essential to be believed in for eternal life. The tendency is to regard the Christian creed as merely of the *bene esse* of religion. Its third paragraph he himself seems to consider as non-*essential* (p. 308). Further, he bears witness that if the sects are less opposed to one another than once, it is only because those who retained some supernatural view of doctrine are now giving it up and so falling into line with the rest; *e.g.* for Baptists baptism now resolves itself into 'a becoming and convenient form' (p. 298). And while we may be deeply thankful that so many millions of Christians profess, at least in name, common fundamentals of faith, shall we forget the vast Mahometan apostasy? In abandoning those fundamentals men cease to be Christians.² We have a further criticism to make. Mr. Gladstone's plea for a recognized place for 'heretics and schismatics' (the expression is his own) in the modern Church may hold good for individuals, but cannot apply to sectarian organizations, or (as he calls them) 'Churches' (pp. 418, 424). These are of man's making, not God's. The Almighty, we are reminded, did not deal with the Ten Tribes after the Schism as He did with Korah and his company (p. 295). Yet Jeroboam 'made Israel to sin.' The modern sects are not in

¹ Yet we cannot help remembering that in 1891 or 1892 the party then led by Mr. Gladstone (who, however, took no personal part in the debates) moved a set motion to enact popular control over voluntary schools.

² Though in a postscript (p. 311) Mr. Gladstone speaks of Unitarians as a section of the Christian body, and guards himself against being thought to reflect on them.

the same case with fourteenth-century Christians perplexed between pope and anti-pope (p. 286); for so far from seeking for the rightful Apostles of the Lord, to obey them, they base themselves deliberately and avowedly on the negation of the apostolic principle and on freedom for believers to combine and organize themselves as they think right. As a convinced individualist and upholder of the divine right of the private conscience Mr. Gladstone perhaps approximates more nearly to their standpoint than he thinks.

We gladly turn to Mr. Gladstone's defence of the Atonement evoked by Mrs. Besant's rash and vain *Autobiography*. Nothing could be more weighty than his vindication of the deeply ethical, and not merely forensic, character of the vicarious Sacrifice, which 'some preachers have so vulgarized by treating the transaction as one across the counter' (p. 326). On the other hand Mr. Gladstone does not rest in the rationalistic explanation of the Cross as meant merely to touch the conscience of transgressors. We need actual incorporation into Jesus Christ, who 'at the cost of great suffering establishes in His own person a type, a matrix, so to speak, for humanity raised to its absolute perfection' (p. 322). We need a real renewal in Him. The Atonement then 'has its foundations deeply laid in the moral order of the world' (p. 329). It is not 'a passport for sin' (p. 331). This is a sufficient reply to the argument that for the One to bear the punishment of the many is immoral. Nevertheless every theory of the Atonement is inadequate by itself. The precious Blood-shedding is also in a true sense *expiatory, propitiatory, satisfactory*. There is a 'wrath of God,' an eternal law that must be vindicated, a debt that must be paid. And the surrender of life is more than a crowning act of obedience; it contains a real mystery; so that Isaac beneath the knife is an incomplete type of the 'obedience unto death, even the death of the *σταυρός*' (Phil. ii. 8). Our Blessed Redeemer's was not *any* kind of 'great suffering,' but the sacrificial death of the representative Man. So that the Atonement is substitutional. Yet we must realize our *identification* with the Sufferer. There is a very wide-spread tendency to minimize the awful significance of the Atonement, and perhaps the favour which a Scotist view of the Incarnation has lately obtained among us proceeds from an unconscious reaction from 'evangelical' insistence on the Cross.

The essay on the 'Lord's Day' has some fine and striking expressions, but is rather circumlocutory and vague. The 'Introduction to Sheppard's Pictorial Bible' panegyricizes the

Bibl
(p.
chief
cover
right
Scrip
prec
ence
and c
copy
discu
The
Hebr
of Is
Rah
of 'J
mode
of am
Chur
hunt
crim
that
Coul
T
about
overh
liber
perso
to th
Chris
to sta
exam
expec
kindl
Chris
have
softer
stone
sider
of stu
exact

1 Is
inspira
than th
2 Ju
VOL

Bible Society's work, 'hundred-handed and hundred-eyed' (p. 358), and the efforts of 'English-speaking Protestants, chiefly of the nonconforming type' (p. 356); but for the rest covers much the same ground as earlier papers. Mr. Gladstone rightly protests against a 'shuffle of precedence' between the Scriptures and 'other Eastern books.' 'It is supremacy, not precedence, that we ask for the Bible' (p. 364), a real difference of kind (p. 372). He somewhat fences with the important question as to errors in the original, other than those of copyists and the like (pp. 388-90).¹ There is an interesting discussion of the act of Jael, 'blessed above women' (p. 391). The two main points to bear in mind are that the house of Heber the Kenite should have been by all the ties of kindred of Israel's part² in that war of extermination, and that, as in Rahab's case, every human being is bound to be on the side of 'Jehovah against the mighty.'³ The truth is that the modern irrational passion of pity, and the ready tolerance of any sins that seem merely rebellions against God or His Church, persuade us to think of Sisera as just an unhappy hunted fugitive. We ought to translate the matter into crimes that we do feel keenly indignant about. Suppose, *e.g.*, that Sisera had been a malignant torturer of little children. Could we have thought any punishment too severe?

The 'Soliloquium' is a reprint of those 'thinkings aloud' about Anglican Orders which it was understood would be overheard in the city on the Tiber. The 'Postscript' is a liberation of Mr. Gladstone's mind when 'the excellent person who fills the Roman chair' (p. 415) turned a deaf ear to the proof of an 'henotic or unifying tendency' among Christians, and the invitation to the Roman communion not to stand aloof. From Pius IX., 'accessible almost beyond example to flattery' (p. 423), nothing but reaction was to be expected. But neither has his successor vouchsafed 'one kindly syllable of appreciation' of the approximations of Christians to one another, nor even 'such efforts as might have been cheaply made through the verbal medium' towards softening and mitigating difficulties (p. 423). With Mr. Gladstone we deeply regret the rigid refusal of the Papacy to consider whether anything in its history may have been a cause of stumbling. But we have to face a logical determination to exact submission *in limine*. It is for English Catholics to

¹ Is there not a common confusion between 'verbal' and 'mechanical' inspiration? The Church has certainly always held something more than that the Bible *contains* the Word of God.

² Judges iv. 11.

³ *Ibid.* v. 23.

demonstrate that in questioning the divine right of Rome to unlimited submission we are contending for true authority, not for private judgment and individual self-will.

ART. III.—SIR RUSSELL REYNOLDS'S 'ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES.'

Essays and Addresses. By SIR J. RUSSELL REYNOLDS, Bart., F.R.S., M.D. Lond.; LL.D. Edin.; LL.D. Aberd.; President of the Royal College of Physicians of London; President of the British Medical Association; Physician to Her Majesty's Household; and Consulting Physician to University College Hospital. (London, 1896.)

THIS volume contains a 'brief sketch of the life of Sir John Russell Reynolds,' 'written,' as his wife's touching Dedication informs us, by 'one who was closely associated with' him 'for five years as his private secretary and valued friend'; the essay on the 'Definition and Nomenclature of Disease,' which formed the introduction to the valuable *System of Medicine* which Dr. Reynolds edited; and twelve addresses and lectures of various kinds.

A friend of Sir Russell Reynolds who is quoted in the 'brief sketch' of his life says that 'those who knew him best' 'know'

'that his incisive scientific perception was associated with a profound sense of those hidden laws of life which elude analysis, but cannot be disregarded by genuinely intellectual minds' (p. xx).

This statement receives very copious illustration from these *Essays and Addresses*. Of the 'incisive scientific perception' there are abundant signs upon which it is hardly the province of the *Church Quarterly Review* to dwell. The 'profound sense of' the 'hidden laws of life which elude analysis' is no less strongly marked, and has more to do with the standpoint from which it is natural that we should chiefly regard this book.

As far back as 1858, in an 'Oration delivered before the North London Medical Society,' Dr. Reynolds called attention to evils which were likely to result from neglect of the study of psychology. He spoke of the fact that medical students often enter upon their 'career of practice' 'without so much as a notion upon psychology, and with ideas of life built up only of anatomy, chemistry, and physics'; he gave a

warn
genera
affecti
medica
ance
pointe
of phy
attitud
that 's
able fa
known
work i
'is the
escaped
have fa
tion sur
there th
how do
nexus l
ances, a
upon th
Where
process
What fi
its worl
dental
results
unsolve
first sug
be given
the mos
us and
that lie
laboriou
process
long sin
means f
wherew
material
'At
chemica
the one
both; a
princip
what is
8-12).

The
the 'F

warning that an 'idea of life' as 'merely a modification of general physical forces' was 'gaining ground and seriously affecting both' the 'teaching and' the 'practice' of the medical profession ; and, while highly estimating the 'importance of accurate physical and chemical examination,' he pointed out the fallacy of resting 'satisfied with but one-half of physiological facts,' and claimed that the truly scientific attitude requires resistance to the 'temptation to suppose' that 'some' accurately ascertained 'ponderable and measurable facts' 'constitute the whole' 'of that which has to be known.' When, he asked, chemical analysis has done its work in investigating, for instance, the process of digestion,

'is there nothing left for us to study ; is there nothing that has escaped us ; nothing that we have left unweighed ; nothing that we have failed in reducing to our formulæ ? Is the physiology of digestion summed up in this expression of chemical results ? What is there that determines the sense of hunger, of thirst, or of satiety, and how do these influence the chemical transpositions ? What is the nexus between thought, sleep, anxiety, or other emotional disturbances, and those sensations ; and through them, or not through them, upon this easily described action of the pepsine and its assistant acid ? Where do mind and feeling come in contact with these material processes, and how do they mutually exert their action and reaction ? What fits the carnivorous stomach for its food, the herbivorous for its work ? How and where is the relation between them and the dental apparatus ? Outside or beyond the most simple chemical results we are at once arrested by a hundred questions, as yet unsolved, and as far, apparently, from solution as they were when first suggesting themselves to the human mind. Partial answers may be given, *i.e.* we may advance the problem one degree further from the most easily observed phenomena ; but a great gulf comes between us and the final answer ; and divide as we will the narrow ground that lies between our starting point and the margin of that gulf ; laboriously measure as we like, and accurately name every step of the process from the first rough fact to that brink, reached in the ages long since passed without such fine calculations, we do not by such means fill up the gulf itself, nor have we yet discovered even a plank wherewith to launch out upon the dark sea that comes between the material and the immaterial, the seen and the unseen.'

'At the one extreme is consciousness, at the other physical and chemical phenomena, and they are placed in mysterious relationship ; the one class is as real as the other, and we have equally to value both ; and in order to arrive at any correct general physiological principles, we must start from the two grounds, and proceed from what is known in each to what is unknown between the two' (pp. 8-12).

The same thought goes through a very valuable lecture on the 'Facts and Laws of Life' which was delivered in the

following year (1859) at 'the opening of the Medical School of the Westminster Hospital.' The true aim of the student of medicine is there defined as being

'so to learn the facts and laws of life, in both health and disease, as to utilize his knowledge in every way, and to the highest degree, for his fellow-men' (p. 40).

From such a definition it follows that 'life' is the 'subject-matter' of his 'study'; and life, it is emphatically declared,

'embraces much more than it sometimes appears to do in' 'physiological handbooks; in it is wrapped up, besides bones, muscles, and intestines, the being and destiny of humanity. It is to be studied in the silent and solitary depths of your own consciousness, as well as in the lecture-theatre and dissecting-room; you must see it in the minds and hearts of your patients, as well as in their limbs and viscera; you have to deal not merely with that which may be analysed, experimented upon, cauterized, bandaged, or cut off and cast away; you have to do not only with those pains which may rack the body or disturb the mind; you have for your study not only the material fabric, which is so mysterious in its facts and processes; but you have also for your study its still more mysterious tenant; you have to do with that which can rise superior to all weakness, and can triumph over all pain; and which in the very article of death may utter the prophecy of a life, as yet unseen, but still felt to be, and to be more real, more strong, than that life which, though so real, is now sinking into silence and decay—a life whose witness here, having just burned into your soul's deepest creed the facts that it is, and that it cannot die, is itself, in another moment, carried beyond your sight. . . . You must see that disease is something far more important, and far deeper, than an aching head, a hurried breathing, or a fluttering pulse; that disease is something much more serious than the mere interference with the mechanism of physical life; that the measure of its evil is, not the increased rapidity of pulse, not the daily wasting of the body nor its numerical frequency in the bills of mortality, but the degree to which it so tells upon the mind, heart, will, and power of man that it prevents him from doing that work in this world which it has been given him to do . . . The mysterious material body which is your care must be regarded as but a subservient part of a more mysterious whole, and you must never forget the higher elements in your eagerness to understand the lower' (pp. 42-4).

And, to quote but one instance more of a very marked feature of the book, we find that the address on the 'Value of Competition,' delivered in 1885 to the 'medical students of University College, Bristol,' contains the emphatic sentence—

'You cannot solve the problems of the sick-room in one quarter of your cases by stethoscope, thermometer, or any such like means' (p. 241).

If
Address
which
make
knows
such a
character
physical
which
fully an
tained
anything
of the l
nerves
is study
beyond
the stu
ence of

The
of true
of phys
in hum
physical

The
part of
of duly
Reynol
our rea
unknow
as well
co-rela

The
statisti
minste
that in
individ

'Pe
drawn f
that be
quency
man, ne
world.
exampl
had not
this, at
be, in 1

If there was nothing else useful in these *Essays and Addresses* but the full and frequent treatment of the point which we have been scantily illustrating, this alone would make the work of high value. Every student of details knows their absorbing power. It is easy to study history in such a way as to lose sight of the play and force of human character. It is easy in a most intimate knowledge of the physical nature of man to forget those parts of human life which no scientific instrument can reveal. And the more fully and completely the working of physical causes is ascertained and realized, the more difficult is it to be mindful of anything which underlies them. The marvels of the structure of the human brain, the beauty of the actions of muscles and nerves may easily so completely absorb the mind of him who is studying them that he has no attention left for anything beyond. We are convinced that this absorbing power of the study of physical details is responsible for the existence of much scientific unbelief.

Thus, it is of the highest importance, both in the interests of true science and in the interests of religion, that students of physical nature should be reminded that there are elements in human life besides those which may be known from physical investigations.

The way of regarding life of which this book is full forms part of a state of mind which is eager to insist on the necessity of duly considering all the factors in a problem. Sir Russell Reynolds is always conscious that, when all which is within our reach has been ascertained, there is much which remains unknown. He bids his hearers be mindful of their ignorance as well as of their knowledge. He insists on the necessity of co-relating different sides of truth.

This breadth of view may be seen in the treatment of statistical fallacies contained in the lecture delivered at Westminster, to which we have already referred. After showing that inferences from statistics cannot be accurately applied to individuals, Dr. Reynolds goes on to say :

'Perhaps the most unwarrantable conclusion which has been drawn from the employment of the statistical method is to the effect that because events occur in such order that their numerical frequency may be calculated beforehand, therefore neither God nor man, neither Divine Providence nor human will, are operative in the world. Because there is a certain average number of suicides, for example, per annum, individual choice and general Providence have had nothing to do with the matter. To arrive at such a principle as this, at the conclusion of a survey of the history of civilization, would be, in my judgment, to conclude in opposition to both historical

evidence and true reason ; but to start with such proposition, and to employ it as a method of investigation, is one of the most extreme examples with which I am acquainted of a *petitio principii*.

'Allow, for a moment, that the principle is correct—viz. that the existence of uniform averages would exclude the idea of will, either Divine or human—the past history of the world, and its present history, are such as to show that these averages have not always existed and do not exist. The ordinary course of events has been suspended, or superseded, by the extraordinary or the supernatural, and the true basis of all nature has been revealed in such suspensions. But, further than to enter protest against such interpretation of history as this is not my object now ; it is to show that, even if the averages exist, they do not warrant a belief in the non-existence of will, either Divine or human. The proposition is this, that, because out of 10,000 individuals, say 100, in the course of twelve months, will do such a particular thing, therefore there was no will in the individuals who did that thing, or in those who did not. The argument in such proposition is erroneous ; it is a conclusion with regard to the individual, from observation on the mass or multitude ; and I have already shown that until the individual has been lost sight of in the multitude—i.e. until the accumulation is so great that it includes every possibility of action and every variety of condition—the statistical result is demonstrably untrue : the statistical law loses all force, and has to be termed a chance, when applied to the individual, i.e. to the very thing or being supposed to exert the will' (pp. 70-1).

Another instance of this characteristic of the author's mind is afforded by the address on 'Specialism in Medicine,' delivered in 1881 at the 'opening meeting of the Medical Society of University College, London.' It must not be supposed that Sir Russell Reynolds is unjust to specialists. There are indeed some scathing descriptions of those whom he thinks to degrade a noble profession ; but it is clearly pointed out that 'the expansion of human life and the increasing complication of its requirements' render 'division of labour' a 'necessity' (pp. 195-6), and strongly affirmed that the practitioner who, called upon to 'undertake anything and everything at a moment's notice,' is 'in the vast majority of instances' 'equal to the occasion,' was fitted for his work by 'specialists' who 'taught him, in the wards of hospitals, and in systematic lectures, and by their writings, that which their special work' 'enabled them to teach, and which they could not by any but the rarest gifts, or still rarer accidents, have obtained in any other way' (pp. 197-8). Still, the line of thought which, throughout this address, is underneath the discussion of various questions the details of which are outside the scope of this *Review*, is that an exact knowledge of a

particu
only w

We
'Preser
second
the yea

'Me
the gro
of facts
closure
enclosu
one sci
chemica
and its
40).

Throug
frame
growth
disease
referre
phenom
of life
the ph
as to
function
But he
real as
covere
the po
nolds's
on the
Thus h

'Gr
which
living
describ
whethe
ultimat
is to be
it seem
and to
insolub
'H
may be
the sam
the nat

particular group of facts is likely to lead to true conclusions only when it is balanced by what is wider and more general.

We may instance also the admirable address on the 'Present Position of our Knowledge,' delivered at the 'forty-second annual meeting of the British Medical Association' in the year 1874. At the outset it is asserted :

'Medicine is no isolated science ; we cannot draw a line round the group of facts which we so denote—nor, indeed, around any group of facts—in such fashion that we may truly say that within its enclosure the whole of any one science lies, and that outside such enclosure all facts must receive a different name. The whole of any one science is the whole of all ; and pathology has its biological, chemical, physical, and mathematical elements on the one hand, and its mental, moral, and social bearings on the other' (pp. 139-40).

Throughout the address which follows, this wide and balanced frame of mind is maintained. The lecturer rejoices in the growth of scientific knowledge which has enabled students of disease to ascertain the natural causes of affections formerly referred to occult influences, and to show that 'processes and phenomena which were held to be among the sacred mysteries of life' are in reality 'facts of chemistry and physics,' while the physician has become 'able so to wield the forces of life as to set right much that was wrong and bring back the functions of organs which were virtually dead' (pp. 141-2). But he will not tolerate any system which ignores facts as real as those which our new scientific knowledge has discovered ; and this is one of the parts of the book which show the point we have already mentioned, that Sir Russell Reynolds's view of life was closely connected with his insistence on the equitable consideration of differing groups of facts. Thus he says :

'Granting that we have removed much of the traditional mystery which obscured the facts of life, that we have resolved many so-called living actions into chemical and physical processes, and have described them in other than "vital" terms, it may still be questioned whether or no we have advanced many steps in the solution of the ultimate and real mystery of life. The tendency of the present day is to believe, and act upon the belief that we have done so ; and, as it seems to me, to push aside awkward facts as irrelevant or unreal, and to smother questionings by representing them as either solved, insoluble, or worthless' (pp. 142-3).

'However keenly and satisfactorily many of the processes of life may be referred to simpler agencies, there will, perhaps, ever remain the same kind of mystery with regard to life itself that still shrouds the nature of those simpler forces, such, for instance, as gravitation

or heat, with regard to the nature of which we have ceased to question. . . . It has been admitted that their essence is beyond our ken, and that we can but study their phenomena ; we have not tried, or have failed if we have tried, to reduce them to a common denominator. But with regard to life, we have drifted away into a sort of belief that it is to be decomposed, explained away, or got rid of ; and that our true line of action is to be followed by such a belief in the future results rather than in the present or the past facts of science. But I claim for life that it be treated with a respect like to that which we have accorded to gravitation ; and I do so because, notwithstanding all the researches of modern science, and all the clever analogies of recent thinkers, it still stands alone, undecomposed by chemist or histologist, and presents a series of phenomena which no known physical or chemical process has explained' (pp. 147-8).

'As physicians and surgeons, it is our part to conserve life by preventing, when we can, the inroad of disturbing agencies ; to preserve life in its integrity of useful work and fit association with all that makes life happy ; to help it in its weakness, heal its suffering, lessen its sorrows, and soothe its closing hours ; but I think we shall accomplish these purposes only by admitting its existence, its separateness from all other forces, acknowledging its mystery, bowing ourselves down before the enigma of its origin, and reverently humbling ourselves in face of its unsearchable but wonder-teeming end' (pp. 153-4).

So, too, while Sir Russell Reynolds welcomes the more accurate knowledge which has got rid of some false distinctions between man and the other animals, he will not allow the progress of science to put out of sight any set of facts about man.

'The tendency, as I read it, at the present day is to pass to the opposite extreme, and to see nothing distinctive in human life ; nothing which cannot be explained in physical function by reference to the lower forms of animal existence ; and nothing in the mental and moral history of ourselves which cannot be referred to analogous processes of material change' (p. 156).

'Let us not, in our haste to generalize, lose sight of the main factor in all education of both mind and limbs, viz. the directive influence of the will, which, whensoever it may come, and howsoever it may work, is yet that which renders possible all the higher acts of man, and which should render it impossible for him so to forget his place in nature, that he needs to learn again the lesson that might be taught him by "the ox that knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib"' (pp. 157-8).

'I am sure that we shall do our work the better, if we come out of and above this lower ground and recognize in the suffering man the fact of qualities which transcend all that we know of the mere animal life ; see in him a sense of duty and self-sacrifice, an outlook to the future and to the unseen, a weariness of the merely temporal,

and a
person
action

Sir

'T
morbid
as I th
It show
anythin
smelt,
muscle
assignin
and at
material

'T
from m
nations
regard
regard
of min
individ
of the
left out
momen
believe
acted o
hours
yesterd
weight
value.
ledge ;
facts of
are any
disrega
them a
your es
much,
other c
observi

It
into a
it seen
be a p
at the
had fu
and c
men M

and a belief in the eternal, that shall lift him into the region of our personal sympathies, and out of those simply physical ranges of action which we recognize in cats and dogs' (p. 162).

Similarly, in another address—

'There is now much modern "scientism" rather than science, a morbid condition of both mental and moral nature, which is exerting, as I think, a mischievous influence upon the lives and hopes of men. It shows itself in this way, in attaching exaggerated importance to anything or any fact which may be weighed, measured, multiplied, smelt, seen, handled or otherwise treated, by the senses or the muscles, in some mechanical manner; and, on the other hand, in assigning an insufficient value to other classes of facts which will not, and at present cannot, be made to submit themselves to such material measurement or registration' (pp. 183-4).

'There is a tendency to look at the order of events, as derived from masses of people now living and the history of the masses or nations that have lived and died, but a curious propensity to disregard the individuals of whom nations and history are made; to regard the measurable physical facts, and to ignore those other facts of mind, of morals, of conscience, and of action, which make up individual life. And yet, curiously enough, in regard to the religion of the individual, it comes to this, that it is put aside altogether, is left out of the account; and it would seem to be thought of no moment that the masses, the hundreds of thousands of persons, have believed, or felt the truth and comfort of some great principle, have acted on it, have lived and died with it as their stay and solace in the hours of keenest suffering or deepest woe; whereas the discovery of yesterday, or the fact that somebody has "determined" the atomic weight of some supposed new "element," is held to be of gigantic value. I do not wish to depreciate the value of any distinct knowledge; but what I want you to feel is, that there are complicated facts of human consciousness and belief, which are as much facts as are any others of physics or of chemistry, and these are not to be disregarded because you cannot understand them. You must take them as they stand, and let them have their weight and due value in your estimate of truth. The facts of religious life and hope are as much, are as verily facts to be taken into consideration, as are any other class of facts which the human mind is capable of feeling, of observing, or recording' (pp. 184-5).

It was this strong breadth of view, insisting on taking into account all the differing factors of a problem, which, as it seems to us, made it possible for Sir Russell Reynolds to be a pioneer and enthusiastic student in medical science, and at the same time a firm believer in the Christian Faith. He had fully and honestly faced those investigations and theories and conclusions of modern science which have made many men Materialists. He had the greatest appreciation of the

services which scientific research and discovery have performed for the medical profession and for human welfare. His high standard of knowledge, his determination to be true to the groups of facts of the spiritual order as well as to those which are subject to physical investigation, showed him that Materialism was scientifically false and mentally unsatisfying. Unless we misread some passages in his writings, he had known the agony of serious doubt; and he had emerged from it, not by shutting his eyes to any parts of truth, but by keeping them open in whatever direction he might look.

Belief in the spiritual nature of man, or the doctrine of a Personal God, or the Christian Faith, may easily be set aside when consideration is limited to particular methods of investigation or the weighing of particular probabilities. What is above all things needed on the natural side of religious inquiry is the inclusion of the various kinds of evidence, and the recollection that it is the whole state of the case, not merely isolated parts of it, which must be kept in view. Religion has everything to gain from investigations which are really impartial in their methods and wide in their scope.

This special bearing of the true breadth of Sir Russell Reynolds's outlook may be observed in the address 'delivered before the Students' Christian Association' in 1876, from which our last quotation was taken. In that address he discusses some of the advantages which such an association may supply, and is led to consider several parts of the conflict between belief and unbelief. In much of his counsel, given from the point of view which we have been emphasizing, we see the highest value.

'Have no fear of facts, have no fear of truth, however it may seem to conflict with your own experience or with testimony. Do not push aside an awkward question because you cannot answer it, there and then. Think and pray; and if, afterwards, you have no answer to give, say so honestly, and wait till you know more, or have felt more, and have found the answer' (p. 180).

'If you meet with a fact of science or history that conflicts with recognized notions, long-established dogmas, and widely spread beliefs, ascertain the nature of that fact. Be satisfied that you are not dealing with charlatans or quacks, who may give you messages through table-rappings or on slates; but be sure of your facts, and then do not fear them. What is true is of God, and you will find its real bearings on other things that are true, if you work and wait.

'Propositions that we formulate for ourselves may seem to contradict each other, or may do so; but, remember, propositions are not facts, but simply our way of looking at or representing our notions

of fac
say, t
disma
work
of the
for ex
ceive
ask o
to me
and a
which
work,

'M
throw
be le
mass
"Thi
not al
oppos
or thi
old p
I hav
so gai
forme
with y

There
difficu
or tha
to con
the wi
power
events
canno
strang
it is a
consci
(p. 18

T
them,
ment,
exhar
diffic
Yet i
been
scienc
Reyn
evolu

of facts, or of something that may not be fact; and here, let me say, that it must be that you meet with such conflict. But be not dismayed; be sure of your fact and hold it fast; and again I say, work and wait. We may [be], and often are, placed in the condition of thought in which we say, "One of two propositions must be true"; for example, matter is infinitely divisible, or it is not; we can conceive no other idea; God is omnipotent, or man is free, and we may ask ourselves on which side we will place our creed; but it seems to me that we are not yet in a position to make these bold assertions and alternatives, for there may be some discovery made to-morrow which shall show a real exit from the difficulty. And so again I say, work, and wait, and trust' (pp. 180-1).

'Now and again some new fact appears in science which might throw discredit upon old and well-established dogma, and you might be led to doubt, say, the circulation of the blood. But there is a mass of fact upon which that doctrine is based enabling you to say, "This new theory may adequately express certain facts, yet it does not alter my conviction as to the general truth to which it seems opposed; the mass of evidence is such that this curious discovery, or this clever way of putting the case, does not drive me from my old position. I must see how it may be reconciled with that which I have held." The weight of evidence and the impetus of thought so gained, carry you over the difficulty, and you hold to the well-formed belief; and it may help you much to know that others are with you in your scientific creed.

'That which is true in science is true in regard to religious faith. There may be, and often are, facts which seem to shake that faith; difficulties which seem insuperable. You may question this miracle, or that statement in the Bible; you may meet with facts that seem to contradict each other, or the Bible; but let me ask you, does not the whole weight of evidence, and the impetus of its grand motor power, carry you over passages that you may not understand, over events of life that you may not witness, and enable you to say, I cannot make this out—this queer text, this inexplicable passage, this strange reversal of all that I should have thought wise or good—but it is a mere trifle when taken in comparison with the great facts of consciousness, of history and tradition, and so I work and wait' (p. 183).

To take in all the facts, and not merely a selected set of them, not to be too sure that apparently contradictory statements may not both be true, or that apparent alternatives exhaust all possibilities, to be patient in the presence of difficulty—all these are the acts of a truly scientific mind. Yet it is impossible even to guess how many might have been saved from unbelief which was accepted in the name of science by regard to such a standpoint. That Sir Russell Reynolds should powerfully describe the inadequacy of evolution, taken by itself, to account for all that there is in

the life of man (pp. 184-90), useful as this is, must be reckoned a less valuable service to religion than his repeated insistence on great central principles of thought.

It is in harmony with the general spirit of the book that the author should protest against arbitrary rejection of parts of our Lord's life by those who are accepting other parts. Such a course of action he stigmatizes as 'dangerous and illogical.' The 'miraculous birth,' the 'life of wondrous influence and wonder-working,' the 'interferences with the ordinary course of nature,' the 'death which He could have avoided,' that "twelve legions of angels" might have saved Him,' that He rose from the grave and ascended into heaven,' are spoken of as facts, and they come to us' in the same way as the 'great moral teachings as to man's conduct,' the 'great teachings as to God' and 'the kingdom of heaven' (p. 191).

'It is the fashion often now to say, The morality is sublime; He put it on the highest ground; it was His purity of soul, not the washing of hands or vessels; He has taught us as no man before ever taught that rightness of motive and not only external behaviour is the sign of religious life. He gave us views of God, and told us about Him that which we could not otherwise know, and for which we are deeply grateful. But He was only a Man, and though the best of men, is not to be regarded as other than a great teacher.

'Now, this I hold to be as pernicious as it is absurd. If Jesus Christ was only a great human teacher, what did He know more about God or morality than any other man who might have arrived at his knowledge by ordinary processes? What could He know more than you or I? He may have inferred or have guessed, but what knowledge had He?

'Again, He distinctly stated that He came from God; that He was free from sin; that He had the power to forgive sin; that no man took His life from Him; that He would rise again. He promised that whatever was asked His Father in His name He would give' (p. 191).

In the passage that follows it is shown that it is unreasonable to regard our Lord as teaching anything but truth; that from the truth of His teaching it follows that 'He came from God and was not mere man,' and 'went to God and ever lives to make intercession for us'; that He has in 'some mysterious manner made God and man at one'; that 'personal association with a still living Christ' can brighten even death (pp. 192-3).

The amount of this volume that directly touches matters

¹ This sentence appears to leave out of sight the possibility of a contention that our Lord, though merely human, was specially inspired.

of theology is small. The influence of the whole of it is in the direction of right thinking and right living. It is eminently calculated to infuse principles which will make men of sound judgment and of high character. Stray points in its occasional touches on theology may not always be stated as we should have expressed them. Doctors may perhaps differ on some few matters among those medical and scientific subjects which we have passed over in silence, not because we do not appreciate the skill shown in dealing with them, but because this is not the place for any such discussion. However these things may be, the book deserves a cordial welcome from all who have the highest interests of their fellows at heart. Among the many noble and useful callings which God gives to men there can be few nobler or more useful than those of the really Christian man of science and the really Christian physician. It must have been a good thing for his profession and his country that a leader and teacher of acknowledged ability and character should have impressed thoughts such as those which these *Essays and Addresses* contain.

ART. IV.—ON A HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED SYRIAC VERSION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version. By JOHN GWYNN, D.D., D.C.L. (Dublin, 1897.)

THE first Syriac book issued from the Dublin University Press is one of which the importance will be readily acknowledged not only by all Syriac scholars, but also by those who are more especially interested in the textual criticism of the New Testament. The work falls into three main divisions—(1) the Syriac text of the Apocalypse, with critical notes; (2) a Greek translation, with notes on the various readings presupposed by the Syriac; and (3) an Introductory Dissertation. The last, however, presents such an able and exhaustive treatment of the different points of interest connected with both the Syriac and Greek texts, as well as of the other questions of importance, that a discussion of the book as a whole naturally resolves itself into a discussion of the Introductory Dissertation. Undoubtedly the main interest of this treatise centres in the conclusion as to the origin of the version (now published for the first time) at which the learned editor arrives, after a thorough examina-

tion of all the evidence at his disposal. This conclusion, we may state at once, is that the present text forms part of the so-called 'Philoxenian version.' Hardly less important, both in itself and also in its bearing on the main point at issue, is the view adopted by Dr. Gwynn as to the Harkleian origin of the text found in the ordinary editions of the Syriac New Testament.

It is well known to all Syriac scholars that the four minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude), as well as the *Pericope Adulteræ* (John 7⁵³⁻⁸¹) and the Apocalypse, were not included in the Peshitto canon. This fact is apt to be overlooked, because the ordinary editions of the Syriac New Testament now contain the portions that are missing from the Peshitto version. Such, however, has only been the case since the beginning of the seventeenth century; prior to that date these books were absent from all then known New Testament Peshitto MSS., as well as from the printed editions. The Apocalypse was first published separately in Syriac by De Dieu in 1627 from a Leyden MS., the four Catholic Epistles by Pococke in 1630 from a manuscript in the Bodleian Library, and the *Pericope Adulteræ* by De Dieu in 1631 from a manuscript belonging to Archbishop Ussher. They appeared soon afterwards as forming part of the Syriac New Testament edited by Gabriel Sionita for the Paris Polyglot in 1633; yet, though the text exhibited in that edition differs only slightly from that of the separate editions of De Dieu and Pococke, it would seem that Sionita did not make use of the work of his predecessors, but rather obtained his text from a different copy or copies. From the Paris edition these additions passed into Walton's Polyglot, and so into all subsequent editions of the Syriac New Testament. Previous scholars have perceived that the Apocalypse belongs to the Harkleian, and the Epistles to the Philoxenian version; and their conclusions have been confirmed by Dr. Gwynn.

The Philoxenian version is the name given to the new translation of the New Testament (and of parts of the Old Testament) executed by Polycarpus the Chorepiscopus under the direction of Philoxenus or Xenaia, the bishop of Mabug, in 508 A.D. Evidence as to this fact is afforded us by Moses Agheleus (c. 550 A.D.), who, in a *Letter to Paphnutius*, prefixed to his Syriac version of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril of Alexandria, refers to 'the translation of the New Testament and of David into Syriac' by Polycarpus (Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* ii. 83). Again, Gregory Barhebraeus in the *Prooemium* to his *Horreum Mysteriorum* states that 'after the Peshitto

the
from
sam
him
vers
turn
and,
took
disa
tion
rega
The
the l
versi
of th
(So
atta
New
hims
basis
man
Barh
versi
impo
ques
by th
whic
C
fortu
to th
in de
taine
natur
inas
Testa
in the
long
Yet i
to pr
1732
to co
date,
Testa
notab
of th

the New Testament was more accurately translated again from the Greek at Mabug in the days of Philoxenus.' The same or a similar statement, attributed to Thomas of Harkel himself, is found in many manuscripts of the Harkleian version. The translation of Polycarpus, however, was in its turn revised by Thomas of Harkel a century later (616 A.D.), and, as is not infrequently the case, the later work quickly took the place of its prototype. In fact so complete was the disappearance of the earlier version that, with but few exceptions, the majority of scholars have until recent times either regarded it as lost or identified it with the Harkleian revision. The latter view, however, is plainly in direct opposition to the language of Barhebræus, who, in the account of the Syriac versions of the Bible given in the *Proœmium*, distinctly speaks of the Harkleian as 'a third version which was rendered (ܐܬܬܬܝܬܐ) by Thomas of Harkel.' Moreover, in a note attached by Thomas of Harkel to his Syriac version of the New Testament (Adler, *Verss. Syr.* p. 47) the translator himself states that he used the Philoxenian version as his basis, and corrected it by the help of two (or three) Greek manuscripts. The same fact is twice attested by Gregory Barhebræus (in his *Chron. Eccles.*), who frequently cites this version in his works, and his statement is of the greatest importance, since it determines the source of the version in question. Additional confirmation of this point is furnished by the more recently discovered portions of the Philoxenian, which show that it differs widely from the Harkleian.

Our manuscript authority for the Harkleian translation is fortunately very large, and there is consequently no doubt as to the characteristics of the version. The chief difficulty lies in determining its precise extent—in brief, whether it contained the book of Revelation or not. *A priori* we should naturally expect the version to include the Apocalypse, inasmuch as it is stated to be a translation of the New Testament, made with the help of Greek manuscripts; for in the time of Thomas of Harkel the book of Revelation had long formed an integral part of the Greek New Testament. Yet it is curious that our manuscript authority seems rather to preclude this view. It was not, indeed, until the year 1732 that manuscripts of the Harkleian version were known to contain anything beyond the four Gospels. Since that date, however, manuscripts of other portions of the New Testament belonging to this version have come to light, notably among the Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum. But of the manuscripts which presumably contain the whole

version it is remarkable that none include the book of Revelation. The manuscript obtained by Ridley in 1732 (New College Library, Cod. 333) from Diarbekr, on which White's edition (1778-1803) was based, unfortunately breaks off at Hebrews 11⁷, while Cod. 334 of the same library does not contain this book, and it is absent from the Cambridge MS. (Add. 1700) which contains the whole New Testament (except the Apocalypse) in the Harkleian version. Moreover in none of the three extant manuscripts which contain the Apocalypse is it associated with any part of the Harkleian. The oldest Nitrian copy (in the British Museum, Add. 17127), which is dated 1088 A.D., contains the text (incomplete) and an elaborate commentary, but no other portion of the New Testament. Similarly the Apocalypse stands alone in the Leyden MS. (Scalig. 18), from which De Dieu derived his text, while Ussher's MS. (Trinity College, Dublin, B. 5. 16) is merely a collection of the non-Peshitto portions of the New Testament (cf. *supra*), made by a Maronite scribe in 1625. To counterbalance the negative testimony of this external evidence we can only adduce the statement of Lelong (*Bibl. Sacra*, i. 191) with reference to the missing manuscript of the Apocalypse in the Florence Library, according to which the manuscript contained a note ascribing the translation to Thomas of Harkel. The scribe, Jacob of Hesron, who wrote this note in 1582 A.D., affirms that he transcribed it from his archetype, which he believed to have been written by Thomas of Harkel himself. In the absence of more decisive testimony we are thus thrown back on the internal evidence afforded by the nature and character of the translation.

The distinguishing characteristics of the method pursued by Thomas of Harkel may be summed up under two heads—(a) an exaggerated literalness, consequent on the desire of the translator to give an exact reproduction of the Greek, and (b) the use of asterisks and obeli in the text itself, together with the insertion of notes and readings on the margin. The natural results of (a) are that the Syriac idiom is habitually sacrificed in favour of Græcisms; the order of words is Greek rather than Syriac; the third personal pronoun is made to do duty for the article; possessive pronouns are expressed separately in conjunction with ܐܝܠܗ , instead of by suffixes attached to the noun; Greek words are transliterated, case-endings and all. With regard to (b) many explanations have been given, which as a rule satisfy part, but not all, of the requirements of the case. Thus it has been held that Thomas of Harkel retained the text of the Philoxenian version and

ado
Gree
are a
seem
of th
the t
read
but
Whe
calyp
Hark
that
in th
rece
Treg
grou
Reve
word
the t
Hark
by D
that
sider
Furth
the F
of rea
the S
on sin
that t
we ca
heads
it is
Apoc
Thom
on, m
cover
in the
regard
of the
ordina
Harkl

¹ T
² B
³ Jo
p. 134
VOL

added on the margin alternative readings derived from his Greek manuscripts. This is very frequently the case, but there are also many instances in which exactly the opposite practice seems to have been followed. The most probable explanation of these *marginalia* has been given by Dr. Gwynn,¹ viz. that the translator exercised his critical judgment in selecting the readings of his text, those which he thought less probable, but still worthy of record, being retained on the margin. When we consider the ordinary printed version of the Apocalypse in the light of these characteristic features of the Harkleian, we have no hesitation in agreeing with Dr. Gwynn that it belongs to the Harkleian version. This view was held in the last century by Ridley, Storr, and Eichhorn, and more recently by Davidson, but has been contested by Adler, Tregelles, and Professor Isaac H. Hall, though on insufficient grounds. In arguing against the Harkleian authorship of Revelation Adler contended that (1) the adoption of Greek words was infrequent, and (2) that in writing proper names the translator followed the Syriac usage as a rule and not the Harkleian or Greek. A sufficient refutation of (1) is furnished by Dr. Gwynn,² while in answer to (2) it may be pointed out that even in texts which are recognised as Harkleian considerable variation is found in the practice of transcribers. Further Adler only adduces two examples of deviation from the Harkleian method of reproduction, both of which admit of ready explanation. Professor I. H. Hall, in his article on the Syriac Apocalypse,³ likewise rejects the Harkleian origin on similar grounds to those of Adler. It is a matter of regret that the second part of his article has never appeared, so that we can only examine his arguments under two out of the five heads into which he divides the subject. As to the *marginalia*, it is noteworthy that the three extant manuscripts of the Apocalypse all contain traces of the system adopted by Thomas of Harkel elsewhere. We shall return to these later on, merely noting here that Dr. Gwynn was the first to discover and make known the presence of some forty asterisks in the Leyden MS. used by De Dieu. It may, therefore, be regarded as certain not only that the Apocalypse formed part of the Harkleian version, but further that the text found in ordinary editions of the Syriac New Testament represents the Harkleian rendering of that book. Now we know that Thomas

¹ *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxvii. p. 271 sq.

² *Introd. Diss.* p. xxix sq.

³ *Journal of Bibl. Literature and Exegesis*, June to December 1882, p. 134 sq.

of Harkel based his version on the Philoxenian, so that if it can be satisfactorily established that the ordinary printed text is based on the text of Dr. Gwynn's MS. the conclusion is not far to seek that the latter text forms part of the Philoxenian version. There can be no doubt that Dr. Gwynn's demonstration of this latter fact is more than sufficient. His conclusions, however, receive material support along another and distinct line of evidence, viz. from the relation that is clearly discernible between the text of the Crawford MS. and that of the 'Pococke' Epistles, additional confirmation being furnished by an examination of the Greek text underlying the two versions of the Apocalypse.

The portions of the Philoxenian version which have as yet been recovered, and which are generally recognized as belonging to that translation, are: (1) A few small fragments of St. Paul's Epistles discovered by Cardinal Wiseman on the margin of the manuscript containing what he erroneously described as the Karkaphensian version;¹ these fragments were published by him in his *Horæ Syriacæ* (p. 78 sq.) in 1828. (2) Ten chapters (imperfect) of Isaiah, edited by Ceriani in his *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* (v. i. 9 sq.) from a Nitrian manuscript in the British Museum (Add. 17106). The reasons for regarding these chapters as part of the translation of Polycarpus, despite the fact that no mention is made elsewhere of his having translated Isaiah, are briefly as follows: On the margin of the great Ambrosian MS. of the Syro-Hexaplar version, at Isaiah 9⁶, a rendering is given which differs both from the Hexapla and from the Hebrew, but agrees closely with the reading of several LXX manuscripts. It is described also as taken 'from that other text which was rendered into Syriac by the care of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabug.' Unfortunately the chapters edited by Ceriani do not include this passage, but the internal evidence clearly proves that they also belong to this 'other text.' For the Greek text presupposed by Ceriani's manuscript is very similar to that of the (LXX) manuscripts which support the variant reading of Isaiah 9⁶. Further, the method and diction of these chapters shows close affinity to the fragments preserved by Wiseman, while a comparison of the text exhibited by these chapters with the translation of Paul of Tella justifies the conclusion that they formed the basis of the latter work. Paul of Tella, as we know, executed his revision of the Syriac of the Old Testament at the same time and place—Alexandria, under Athanasius I. (Camelarius) of Antioch—as

¹ Cf. Wright, *Syriac Liter.* p. 21.

Tho
Phil
Glay
from
Ceri
Poc
worl
Dav
stat
ence
Poc
the
rend
(e.g.
tran
over
inva
with
is us
exem
pres
text
are n
dated
Hall
that
also
P
sion
the S
the A
from
Profe
clusic
Hall,
positi
start
transl
that
attem
hand

Thomas of Harkel, and both, it would seem, made use of the Philoxenian version. Lastly, in the Syriac version of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril, alluded to above, there are many citations from Isaiah which agree word for word with the text of Ceriani.¹ (3) The four minor Catholic Epistles published by Pococke in 1630 may be regarded without hesitation as the work of Polycarpus, in accordance with the opinions of Davidson, Hall, and Gwynn.² Thomas of Harkel on his own statement followed the version of Philoxenus and the dependence of the Harkleian version on the text represented by Pococke's edition is abundantly clear from a comparison of the two. The two texts not only agree very closely in their renderings, but they also reproduce the same mistranslations (e.g. treating ἐπιλύσεως as a nominative in 2 Peter 1²⁰ and translating αἰδίοις wrongly by 'unseen' in Jude 6). Moreover, where they agree in their rendering, the Harkleian invariably presents a Græcized form of the other, in accordance with its usual practice; where they differ their disagreement is usually to be explained by the variation of their Greek exemplars. The readings of the former are also frequently preserved on the margin of the Harkleian, or retained in the text with an asterisk. Several manuscripts of these Epistles are now extant, notably a Nitrian manuscript (Add. 14623), dated 823 A.D., and the 'Williams' MS. (1471 A.D.), edited by Hall in 1886, both of which exhibit a much superior text to that of Pococke's MS. The Epistles occur in the same form also in the manuscript of Archbishop Ussher.³

Professor Hall claims Philoxenian authorship for the version of the Gospels contained in a manuscript belonging to the Syrian Protestant College at Beyrouth (ninth century [?]), the Acts and Epistles included in the same manuscript being from the Peshitto.⁴ But the arguments brought forward by Professor Hall, when viewed in the light of Dr. Gwynn's conclusions, are clearly seen to be beside the point. Professor Hall, indeed, seems to be at fault in regard to two main positions which he takes up. On the one hand he appears to start from the assumption that the Philoxenian and Harkleian translations were carried out on almost the same lines, and that the former represented an earlier and less thorough attempt at a revision according to the Greek. On the other hand he seems to take it for granted that the Peshitto and

¹ Gwynn, *Dict. of Christian Biogr.* 'Polycarpus' (5).

² Cf. article on 'Polycarpus,' quoted above.

³ Cf. *supra*, p. 328.

⁴ *Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Literature and Exegesis*, 1882.

not the original Greek formed the basis of both versions. From this point of view he naturally infers that the Philoxenian would approximate more closely to the Peshitto, and since the Beyrouth Codex shows more affinity to that version than White's edition of the Harkleian, he concludes that this manuscript exhibits the Gospels according to the Philoxenian version. Possibly Dr. Gwynn is right in conjecturing that the Beyrouth MS. is an example of a 'mixed text,' but from Professor Hall's description the text appears to be Harkleian corrected after the Peshitto.

For our present purpose, however, the portion of the Philoxenian version which is most important is that represented by Pococke's Epistles. The Philoxenian Epistles are distinguished throughout by a free idiomatic Syriac style; the translator does not aim at giving a literal reproduction of the Greek, but rather at conveying the sense of the original in accordance with Syriac usage and idiom. He thus avoids Græcisms as much as possible, and strives to represent each word and phrase of the Greek by its corresponding equivalent in Syriac. The Harkleian version, however, as we have seen, is characterized by extreme literalism. Now Dr. Gwynn shows that the relation existing between his text and that of the ordinary Apocalypse is similar to that which exists between the Pococke Epistles and the same Epistles in the Harkleian version. (For convenience we follow Dr. Gwynn's example in citing the two versions as S and Z respectively.) The former text (S) is remarkable for the manner in which it combines the preservation of Syriac idiom with fidelity to the Greek text which it represents. The language is singularly free not only from Greek forms and expressions, but also from those phenomena which characterize the later development of the Syriac language. It thus clearly reflects the Syriac of an early period, when the various forms still retained their original force and significance. The fact that Græcisms of all kinds are avoided may be in part explained by the nature of the book itself. For the Apocalypse is essentially Semitic in form and conception, being largely based on different parts of the Old Testament, and the translation in consequence offers fewer difficulties than that of the other New Testament books, more especially to an author who, as is clearly apparent in the present case, was familiar with the Peshitto version of the Old Testament. The corresponding Harkleian version, however, shows that the nature of the book to be translated was not in itself sufficient to deter a translator from slavish imitation of the Greek original, and that the purity

of the
placed
latter
examp
frequ
misuse
latter
repres
retenti
later v
suffixe
(4) the
pressin
(5) the
forms,
usage,
gence
notice
terizes
these
fact t
or exp
exerci
consis
The tr
in rep
the sa
appea
inaccu
and d
the tr
of the
differ
signs
exam
heads
variati
found
the sa
in so
second
as to
versio
in wh

of the language exhibited in the Crawford version is to be placed to the credit of the translator. In illustration of this latter point we need only cite a few of the more striking examples collected by Dr. Gwynn (p. xxvii *sq.*): (1) the frequent use of the *absolute state* as opposed to the later misuse of the *status emphaticus*, and the employment of the latter to express the definite article, which the Harkleian represents by the personal or demonstrative pronoun; (2) the retention of the *constr. state*, the use of which is avoided in later writings; (3) the possessive force of the pronominal suffixes, in contrast to the later separate usage with ܐܢܝ; (4) the preference shown for the enclitic pronoun in expressing the substantive verb rather than for ܐܬܝ or ܐܬܝܢ; (5) the use of ܐ as a final conjunction as opposed to the fuller forms, such as ܐܬܝܢܐ. In all these cases Σ follows the later usage, and is thus distinguishable from S. The wide divergence that marks the two translations is, of course, especially noticeable in the literal adherence to the Greek which characterizes the version of Σ, but is consistently avoided by S. To these must be added another point of difference, viz. the fact that Σ almost invariably uses the same Syriac word or expression to represent the Greek equivalent, whilst S exercises considerable freedom of choice, and is by no means consistent in its rendering of the same word or expression. The translator of the latter, in fact, uses his critical judgment in reproducing the various shades of meaning expressed by the same word in Greek. In some cases, it is true, the change appears to be purely arbitrary, while in others it is due to inaccuracy or to misunderstanding; but these cases are rare and do not affect the high standard of excellence to which the translation as a whole attains. But as in the parallel case of the Pococke Epistles so here also we find that marked difference of method and style is accompanied by undoubted signs of the dependence of the one upon the other. Notable examples of dependence are given by Dr. Gwynn under the two heads (a) of variations of rendering and (b) of grammatical variations. The former class comprises cases in which Σ is found to depart from its habitual usage of always representing the same Greek word by the same equivalent in Syriac, and in so doing follows the variant translation of S. Under the second head are included cases of exceptional usage, either as to grammatical form or construction, in which the two versions agree (p. xxxi *sq.*) A few more remarkable instances, in which Σ, forsaking its ordinary method, adopts the ren-

dering of S, are added on p. lxxxii; the most striking of these is the mistranslation of 'Αβδδών (9¹¹) by ܐܒܕܕܐ, which is found in both S and Σ, though the custom of the latter is to transliterate words of this type. 'The inevitable inference from these and like examples seems to be that the influence, and therefore the priority, of S is manifested in exceptional departures, such as these, from the usual method and diction of Σ.' But Σ, as has been shown above, is certainly the Harkleian version; and in view of the known dependence of the Harkleian on the Philoxenian, the conclusion is irresistible that S belongs to the latter version. It is supported (though the support is needless) by the close resemblance which it exhibits to the 'Pococke' Epistles and the fragments of Isaiah (*v. supra*).

Further, in his elaborate and masterly examination of the Greek text underlying the two versions (p. xxxix *sqq.*) Dr. Gwynn has conclusively shown that S as a rule has preserved a more archaic type of text than Σ, and that the latter shows signs of dependence on S in text as well as in diction.

With regard to the Crawford MS. (Syr. 2), from which the present text is derived, nothing more is known than that it was purchased by the late Earl of Crawford *c.* 1860. The manuscript itself is remarkable not only because it exhibits (as has been shown) the Philoxenian version of the Apocalypse and of the four minor Catholic Epistles (for the text of the latter is identical with that of the 'Pococke' Epistles), but also because it is practically the only Syriac Biblical MS. which contains the whole New Testament according to the ordinary canon. The internal grounds on which it is assigned to the last quarter of the twelfth century can scarcely be disputed, supported as they are by the authority of such experts as the late Dr. W. Wright, Dr. Hörning, and Dr. Gwynn. Briefly, these grounds are (i) the close resemblance of the writing to that of other manuscripts known to belong to the latter half of the same century, and (ii) the fact that the manuscript was written (according to the colophon) at Tur'abdin, in N.E. Mesopotamia.¹

The last section of the Introduction is devoted to an interesting discussion of the evidence furnished by the colophon as to the origin and history of the manuscript, in which the learned editor affords yet another proof of his great powers of research and of his extensive knowledge of the subject, as well as of that critical acumen which is so abundantly displayed throughout his work.

¹ Cf. further Dr. Gwynn, *Transactions of the R. I. A.* xxx. 364 *sq.*

Nichol
I

WE d
misse
other
uniqu
spear
count
his se
to say
he too
count
line o
not in
blush
Engli
be for
well o
know
the c
reflec
know
comm
and t
a det
little
the c
class
the la
prise.
suppl
list in
been
conve
articl
by D
mem
the F
ham)
is da
and t

ART. V.—NICHOLAS BREAKSPEAR.

Nicholas Breakspear (Adrian IV.), Englishman and Pope.

By ALFRED H. TARLETON. (London, 1896.)

WE do not care to measure by how much Cardinal Manning missed his election to the Papacy, or to ask in how many other cases an Englishman has been as near as he was to that unique position. For the fact remains that Nicholas Breakspear appears in solitary grandeur in the history of his fellow-countrymen as the only Englishman who ever actually took his seat on the Papal throne. It is a satisfaction to be able to say at once that his personal character and the part which he took in the state-craft of his age were worthy of his native country, and have given him no mean place in the august line of his fellow-pontiffs. The publicity of a Pope's life did not in his case bring anything to light which need raise a blush on an Englishman's cheek. His life at Rome was what Englishmen expect an Englishman's to be, wherever he may be found. He was strong, honourable, brave, and good. He well deserves to be known by his fellow-countrymen, and the knowledge is of the kind which is greatly calculated to benefit the character of those who acquire it. But we are sorry to reflect how little the name and life of the English Pope is known among us. At the best the only facts which are at all commonly known are, that he was the only English Pope, and that he was said to have been choked to death by a fly—a detail which we once unexpectedly found to be known by a little girl in a young ladies' seminary, and which illustrated the curiously out-of-the-way information which such middle-class private schools contrive to impart. Mr. Tarleton notices the lack of knowledge (Pref. p. v) with an expression of surprise. But the reason is at hand, and, indeed, he himself supplies us with it in his preface and in the bibliographical list in Appendix II. (p. 266). Breakspear's career has not been made easily accessible to English people, at least in any convenient separate book. Certainly we have a learned article on Adrian IV. in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, by Dr. Creighton, Bishop of London, and a short sketch or memoir in the publications of the Society of Antiquaries, by the Rev. E. Trollope (afterwards Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham), which Mr. Tarleton dates in 1857, but in *Crockford* it is dated 1856. These, however, are not generally accessible, and the only other English lives of Adrian that have been

published have been one by Richard Raby in 1849 (Roman Catholic), and a small book by the Rev. S. Baynes, which is now out of print, and is not included by Mr. Tarleton in his Appendix II.¹ The scholar who knows how to collect scattered materials will of course find sufficient details for a biography in standard histories of England, Europe, and the Papacy.² But what is required is a compact life of Breakspear which is reliable and cheap, written in a lively style, and made attractive to the ordinary reader. Mr. Tarleton's work is not of this popular kind, but he has done much to bring such a publication nearer, and the scholar who writes for the people must take care to have Mr. Tarleton's book by his side. It is a sumptuous quarto volume, brought out apparently regardless of expense, printed in large type on good rough paper, and copiously adorned with excellent illustrations. A perusal of these is interesting in itself, and prepares the way for a consideration of the Pope's history.

Fourteen initial letters have been copied from old books of various dates, such as a twelfth-century manuscript in the British Museum, Bail's *Concilia*, Stowe's *Chronicle* of 1615, Matthew Paris, Fuller's *Church History* (1656), the *Saxon Chronicle*, Ciaconius's *Lives of the Popes* (1687), Camden's *Anglica Scripta*, Dugdale's *Monasticon*, Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, and Holinshed's *Chronicles*. The maps which are particularly required are those of Western Europe and of Italy in the twelfth century. These are both provided (pp. 26, 237), and to them is added a third map of Central Italy, which shows the movements of Adrian IV. and Frederic Barbarossa at the time of Easter, 1155 (p. 104). A genealogical table (p. 229) exhibits the family connexions of the Countess Matilda and Frederic's relationship to the Guelphs, and so possesses a special interest for the English historian. The Pope's seal is reproduced upon the title-page, and at p. 258 we have a facsimile of one of his bulls, which is fully described in Appendix I. Among the illustrations of localities connected with the Pope's life are the fine old house of

¹ We have caused search to be made both in the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, but can find no trace of Mr. Baynes's book at either of these places.

² Some of the historians, however, devote singularly little space to the pontificate of Adrian IV., perhaps because they have allowed themselves to be too much influenced by its short duration. For example, Mosheim (i. 285) devotes but two short paragraphs to it, so inadequate and unsatisfactory as almost to expose him to a charge of *suppressio veri*. But he gives a reference in a footnote *in loc.* to the accurate and circumstantial account in Count Bunau's *History of Frederic I.*, to which Mr. Tarleton might have referred.

Brea
said, l
graph
of the
at Ro
high a
by Lo
copies
Adria
120).
includ
in Sa
only i
portra
214),
Adria
From
taine
Engl
specia
paint
tomb
tion
marb
skull,
in bas
(p. 2
himse
est, c
duxit
curio
Ciac
Bene
Pope
illust
chara
lish t
worth
will
there
Matt
ficen

1
he say
histor

Breakspears in the valley of the Colne, from which, as Fuller said, he 'fetcht his name' (p. 16), reproduced from a photograph taken in 1895 by the Duke of Newcastle, the portico of the Church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo, which Adrian built at Rome (p. 222; cf. p. 255), and a completed design of the high altar screen at St. Alban's Abbey, from an etching lent by Lord Aldenham (p. 252). There is also a fine picture, copied from an old panel of unknown date, of the entry of Adrian IV. and Frederic Barbarossa into Rome in 1155 (p. 120). The portraits of those who were connected with Adrian include one of Pope Eugenius III. (Bernard of Pisa), depicted in Sacchi's *Historia* in 1610. Between him and Adrian there only intervened the brief pontificate of Anastasius IV. The portrait of Cardinal Roland Bandinelli, also from Sacchi (p. 214), shows us the man who, as Alexander III., succeeded Adrian, and who canonized St. Thomas à Becket (p. 259). From prints in the British Museum, portraits have been obtained of St. Bernard of Clairvaux (p. 72), Henry II. of England (p. 156), and Frederic Barbarossa (p. 204). In special relation to Adrian himself we have a copy of a painting, by B. Venuti (Rome, 1895), which shows Adrian's tomb, and a fine portrait from a mosaic in the Vatican collection (frontispiece). The tomb is a large sarcophagus of red marble, now in the crypt of St. Peter's. It bears the deer's skull, which is the sign of St. Albans, and two English roses in bas-relief, with the simple inscription 'Hadrianus Papa IIII.' (p. 246). The epitaph which he is said to have written for himself was not placed upon his tomb: 'Adrianus hic situs est, qui nihil sibi infelicius in vita, quam quod imperaret, duxit' (p. 255). The other portraits of Adrian, which differ curiously from each other, are taken from Sacchi (p. 65), from Ciaconius (p. 150), and from the British Museum (p. 196). Beneath this last is reproduced a full-sized facsimile of the Pope's signature (see p. 259). The one point about the illustration of the book which does not satisfy us is the futile character of the small devices which are intended to embellish the page at the close of each chapter. These are unworthy of the rest of the volume. From the illustrations we will now turn to the details of Adrian's career. For these there are three primary sources of information open to us: Matthew of Paris,¹ whose great tendency to exalt the magnificence of St. Alban's Abbey requires his story to be used

¹ What Mr. Tarleton says as possible of Matthew of Paris on p. 2 he says as certain on p. 179—that his history is a compilation from other histories.

with caution; William of Newburgh, who is trustworthy, free from prejudice, and well informed; and the life given by Muratori in his *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, which, according to Watterich, was written by Cardinal Boso, nephew, private secretary, and chamberlain to Adrian IV. Mr. Tarleton gives a careful account of their evidence, as well as the later traditions of other writers (pp. 1-20).

Nicholas Breakspear was born in, or near, the year 1100. The name, like Shakespeare's, lends itself to various forms of spelling, and we find Brekspere, Brakspere, Brekespere, and Breakespeare—in early French *Briselance*, and in early Latin *Hastafragus*. Matthew Paris calls his father Robert de Camera, and we can only guess what was the origin of this name. It may have been that he was connected with a small camera or preceptory near his home, or, that when he afterwards went to St. Albans, he became *camerarius* or chamberlain there, as his kinsman, Boso, became at the Vatican (pp. 14-15). It seems impossible to say with certainty where Nicholas was born. Two places are traditionally connected with his birth: Abbot's Langley in Hertfordshire, which belonged to the abbots of St. Albans; and Harefield, on the Hertfordshire border of Middlesex, where the small country house named Breakspears is situated, having borne the name at least since the end of the twelfth century. Camden, and Fuller, who follows him, both allot the honour to Abbot's Langley (pp. 10-12). A third place, Brill-on-the-Hill, in Buckinghamshire, has also been claimed as the birthplace of Nicholas, apparently without even the authority of tradition (p. 17). There is a general agreement in the early accounts that Robert, the father of Nicholas, entered the monastery at St. Albans, being a man of slender means and some education, but there are considerable discrepancies and improbabilities in the answers to the inquiry how long he lived there, or what were the circumstances of the relation of Nicholas to his father and to the Abbey. Matthew Paris, whose account contains at least one palpable error and more than one unlikely detail, tells us that Nicholas applied to the abbot for admission, but was kindly told that he was as yet insufficient in learning (p. 2). William of Newburgh, of whom Mr. Tarleton speaks very highly (p. 9), says that Nicholas was driven away by his father (p. 4). The only other piece of evidence which deserves to be put on a level with these two writers' testimony is the statement of Cardinal Boso, if he be the author of the *Life of Adrian IV.* in Muratori, that Nicholas

left his
ledge
prefer
count
partic
Nichol
his ov
vain, l
happy
He w
that l
thinks
warrior
Trolle
Paris
starte
the o
Engla
We c
we m
it is a
is said
the ea
Pope
veals
Angli

By
across
of th
In th
of St
37-8
of ra
eloqu
spirit
(pp.
mate

1 8
forbid
First
Notes
and s
dange
sports
comm
iv. 14

left his own country 'being ambitious of extending his knowledge' (p. 6). We are bound to say, in spite of Mr. Tarleton's preference for William of Newburgh, that Boso's too brief account rather supports Matthew Paris, who seems to us in this particular to have given the true account of the rejection of Nicholas at St. Albans. Whatever the reason was, we have his own authority (pp. 19, 132) for saying that he tried in vain, by a mishap which Fuller quaintly says was rather a happy miss, to gain admission to St. Albans (pp. 12, 19). He worked his way to France, and there is evidence to show that he spent some time in, or near, Paris. Mr. Tarleton thinks that he stayed with Suger, the great ecclesiastical warrior statesman,¹ who was Abbot of St. Denys, and Mr. Trollope speaks of him as studying in the University of Paris (pp. 27, 35). He is now at any rate to be regarded as started upon his career; and at this point Mr. Tarleton takes the opportunity of giving a short account of the condition of England and France in the first quarter of the twelfth century. We cannot follow him into the details of this sketch, although we must say in general terms that the chapter (p. 21) in which it is attempted is rather thin and very rambling. But enough is said to enable us to form some idea of the setting in which the early life of Breakspear was placed and of the extent of the Pope's temporal power. On pp. 32 and 108 Mr. Tarleton reveals his own standpoint to us as that of a modest sound Anglican Churchman.

Breakspear did not stay long near Paris, but wandered across the Rhone to Arles in Provence, then politically a part of the German empire, and from there he went to Avignon. In this neighbourhood he sought for admission to the abbey of St. Rufus, a large monastery of Augustinian canons (pp. 37-8). He was now a most painstaking scholar, possessed of rare qualities of temper, endowed with a natural gift of eloquence and a sweet voice, cautious of speech, cheerful in spirit, obedient to authority, and of much personal beauty (pp. 35-7). It is not surprising, if this is even only approximately an accurate description, that he became most popular

¹ Such a combination of ecclesiastical and secular functions was forbidden by the seventh Chalcedonian Canon. See *The Canons of the First Four General Councils* (Clarendon Press), p. 39, and Dr. Bright's *Notes on the Canons*, pp. 148-50; cp. the passage on Episcopal warriors and statesmen in Dr. Liddon's *Clerical Life and Work*, p. 306. The danger now arises from the demands upon the time of the clergy for sports, social amusements, and popular forms of recreation, or again for committee work in connexion with secular philanthropy. Cp. 2 Macc. iv. 14; St. Matt. iv. 8, 9.

among his brethren, and so esteemed by the abbot that he was made prior. In 1137 he was unanimously chosen by the brethren to be their abbot, and at once showed that power of command which is always displayed when a man of strong will, rigid principle, and knowledge of mankind is placed in a responsible position (p. 40). The easy-going members of the order had not reckoned on having a strict abbot, and the inevitable dissatisfaction which arose led to complaints more than once before the Pope, Eugenius III. (Bernard of Pisa), a man whose character bore a good deal of resemblance to that of Abbot Breakspear himself. The Pope quickly took the measure both of the monks and their abbot, and at last he dismissed the brethren and kept Breakspear about his own person. As the deputation of monks withdrew, if they congratulated themselves on getting free from their severe superior, they may also have learned, from the scathing words with which they were dismissed, that there was a punitive character for them about the removal of their abbot, and it must have been a surprise to them to discover that their complaint had only ended in placing Breakspear on the high road to further advancement (p. 45).

It was apparently in 1146 that Breakspear was made Bishop of Albano and a cardinal. Arnold of Brescia was in uncontested possession of Rome, and the disastrous episode of the second crusade was about to begin. St. Bernard was rousing the enthusiasm of France and Germany, and Eugenius III. not only wrote a celebrated letter to the King of France to stir him up, but also went to Paris in the Easter of 1147, accompanied, it seems, by the Bishop of Albano, and presented Louis with the pilgrim's staff and wallet in the Abbey of St. Denys. The grand scene must have stirred up deep emotions in the heart of Nicholas Breakspear. 'Prince, cardinal, bishop, a high and puissant lord of the Holy Church, he rides in, the confidential friend of the Pope himself, through those abbey gates at which he had begged, a humble suppliant for admission, a few short years before' (pp. 46-7). He now rapidly advanced in reputation, and we find him signing bulls of Eugenius III. in 1151 and 1152, and in this year chosen, and wisely chosen on account both of his character and of his nationality,¹ as Papal Legate to Scandinavia. Denmark, or as Mr. Tarleton prefers

¹ The natural sympathy between the English and the Norsemen was illustrated conspicuously by the reception accorded to Dr. Nansen, and by his reply at the Royal Societies' Club banquet on February 5; see the *Times*, February 6, 1897.

with so
dent m
been n
Church
Hamb
protest
Breaks
affairs
that t
Norwa
fortuna
traces
about
(p. 55)
remark
overco
tical a
ton ha
the ou
impres
made
St. Ol
Mr. T
confus
Church
Man
added
hundr
Norwe
of hea
Peter'
both i
the w
foreign
whose
To th
Norwe
(p. 59)
Here
the h
mind
hibite
intenc
Lund
confe

with some pedantry to say Danemark, obtained an independent metropolitan see in 1102 at Lund, having previously been under the Archbishop of Hamburg. Moreover, the Churches of Norway and Sweden were transferred from Hamburg to Lund, and this led to a magnificent mission of protest to Pope Eugenius III., who appointed Cardinal Breakspear Papal Legate, with full powers to settle the affairs of the Church in Norway and Sweden. It is recorded that the legate passed through England on his journey to Norway, and, although his own account of his visit is unfortunately (p. 255) not forthcoming, there are a few lingering traces of his doings in his native land, and it seems to have been about this time that Boso, his nephew, became his secretary (p. 55). The mission to Scandinavia was accomplished with remarkable success, and many difficulties were triumphantly overcome. It is not necessary to go into many of the ecclesiastical and civil details of Scandinavian history which Mr. Tarleton has carefully summarized. It will be sufficient to trace the outline of Cardinal Breakspear's work, and to notice the impression which he made upon the northern people. He made Nidrosia, the modern Drontheim, where the bones of St. Olaf reposed, the seat of the archbishopric of Norway. Mr. Tarleton's note upon the additions to the see is much confused (p. 58), but it is a point of interest to the English Church historian to notice that parts of the See of Sodor and Man were taken away from the province of York and added to the new province, where they remained for two hundred years. Breakspear thoroughly reformed the Norwegian Church, swept away abuses, checked the growth of heathen practices in Catholic ritual, bound Norway to pay Peter's pence, and accomplished considerable civil reforms, both in public and in private affairs. He became the hero of the whole nation, and 'Snorow, the historian, relates that no foreigner ever came to Norway who was so honoured, or whose memory is so cherished as that of Nicholas Breakspear. To this day his name is mentioned among the greatest in Norwegian history, and is included among the national saints' (p. 59). He departed to Sweden amid universal lamentation. Here the Swedish bishops and the Gothlanders each claimed the honour of the archbishopric, and the legate made up his mind not to create a province for Sweden at all. He exhibited masterly diplomatic skill by handing over the pallium intended for the Primate of Sweden to the Archbishop of Lund, who was naturally vexed at the loss of Nidrosia, and conferred other rights and honours upon him, which were not,

however, all subsequently confirmed at Rome (pp. 61, 64). In Sweden too he tried, though unsuccessfully, to make peace in civil affairs. His achievements earned for him such titles as 'the Apostle of the North' and 'the Good,' and he returned to Rome covered with the honour of two, if not of three, nations. On one page (64) Mr. Tarleton says that he arrived in Rome early in 1154, and on the next that he did not return to Rome until the November of that year. At any rate, Eugenius III. was dead, and on December 3, 1154, his successor Anastasius IV. died also. He had been a benevolent old man of ninety at his election, and his reign, distinguished chiefly for his charity to the poor, lasted only seventeen months. When he died the minds of the cardinals were filled with the great deeds of Cardinal Breakspear in the north, and he was unanimously chosen to fill the vacant throne.

'By sheer merit and force of character he had risen step by step to the topmost rung of the ladder, never flinching, never losing his head, overcoming every obstacle with indomitable courage, and above all with that simple faith and clear character which has ever helped those who on the thorny path to greatness, have been blessed with these invaluable and divine gifts' (p. 66).

Why he took the name of Adrian we do not know.

The first serious matter with which the new Pope had to deal is connected with the name of Arnold of Brescia, the enthusiastic pupil of Abelard—'Goliath's armour-bearer' in fact, as St. Bernard scornfully called him. We cannot be drawn aside by the fascinating subjects which are suggested by the mention of Bernard and Abelard,¹ for they do not really belong to the history of Adrian IV. Mr. Tarleton, however, allows himself to be allured into rather too many of the by-paths which lead away from his main track, and, with an evident desire to press onward, he stays to trace to some extent the career both of St. Bernard (p. 71) and Abelard (p. 75), and the conflict between them (p. 79). We need not even try to estimate how far Abelard is to be held responsible for the notions which filled the mind of Arnold, though we may remember that history is not without some instances in which the excesses of a pupil have injured the reputation of his master, never more so perhaps than in the stain by which Photinus sullied the memory of Marcellus of Ancyra, in the fourth century. Whatever could be said on

¹ The chief references to these two great names in various articles in the *Church Quarterly Review* are given, with allusions to other works, in our review of Mr. Sparrow Simpson's *Lectures on St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, No. 83, pp. 240-1.

this top-
tical g-
agitato-
and mo-
cessors
ears of
He spr-
and the
of her
Libera-
condem-
during
Adrian
the Po-
republ-
strong
victory
Tarleto-
an arti-
(p. 94)
leave
attack-
first ti-
expel
The d-
those v-
narrate-
impress-
neither
Arnold
lynch
Th
name
beard,
one of
the mo-
their r-
on the
far fro-
castle
Barba-
apprec-
Freder-
when
weake-

this topic, Arnold of Brescia appears in the face of ecclesiastical grandeur, laxity, and corruption as the socialistic agitator of the twelfth century. He was ambitious, clever, and more enthusiastic than wise, and had had some predecessors in the demands for reform, but none who tickled the ears of the powerful citizens of Lombardy so cleverly as he. He spread the doctrine that the Church would be spiritualized, and the more fitted for her holy work, when she was deprived of her wealth, as if he were the chairman of a twelfth century Liberation Society. He escaped to Zürich when he was condemned with Abelard, and his power was undermined during the pontificate of Eugenius, but on the election of Adrian IV. he prompted the senate of Rome to demand that the Pope should recognize the temporal authority of the republic. Adrian at once rose to a position which called for strong and decided action. The description of his triumphant victory is finely described by Cardinal Boso, of whom Mr. Tarleton interposes at this point—unhappily, we think, from an artistic point of view—some graphic details from Ciaconius (p. 94). When Arnold had refused to obey the Pope's order to leave Rome, and when a venerable cardinal had been openly attacked on his way to the Papal presence, the city for the first time was laid under an interdict, and was compelled to expel Arnold and to submit entirely to the Pope (p. 100). The dark and awful episode of the execution of Arnold by those who were in charge of Adrian's interests, is impartially narrated and discussed by Mr. Tarleton, and he leaves the impression upon us, which we hope is correct, that the Pope neither knew nor subsequently approved of the way in which Arnold was put to death—practically, as we should now say, by lynch law.

The crisis of Adrian's pontificate brings us to the great name of Frederic, whose German surname, Rothbart or Redbeard, was rendered into Barbarossa by the Italians. He is one of the greatest national heroes of German history, and the most powerful of the Hohenstauffen emperors, who took their name from the castle built by the founder of the family on the Hohenstauffen, a hill over two thousand feet high, not far from Stuttgart in Würtemberg. Very scanty ruins of the castle remain to this day. Mr. Tarleton tells us as much of Barbarossa's character and history as we need to know to appreciate the struggle between him and Adrian (p. 114). Frederic was by far the most powerful monarch in Europe when Adrian became Pope. Louis VII. of France was weakened by the losses of the second crusade, and the recent

death of Suger, who died in 1152. Henry II. had only just become the king of a disordered realm, and was busy with a war in Wales (p. 115). Frederic aimed at absolute imperial supremacy on the Tiber as well as on the Rhine and Danube, and declared that he derived his power from God alone, and not through any mediation of the successor of St. Peter. In Adrian IV. he encountered a pontiff whose notions of Papal supremacy were every bit equal to those of Gregory VII., and the meeting of two such mighty potentates was watched by the whole of Christendom. Both were alive to the possibility of its momentous consequences, though no one then could know that the contest which was beginning would ultimately end in the overthrow of the Hohenstauffen dynasty. Mr. Tarleton falls under the spell of the grand scene, and we can gather from his description some lively ideas of it (pp. 116-121). The immediate point in dispute between the two was one of those ridiculously trivial matters which are seized upon in all ages of the world's history as the cause of battle when tremendous issues really lie behind the combatants. The Pope insisted that the Emperor should pay the ancient homage of holding the Papal stirrup as its owner dismounted. There was a protracted, and as it may have appeared to the outward eye a very unequal, struggle, but it ended in a decisive victory for the Pope. The Englishman thoroughly vanquished the German, and when Frederic had dismounted, advanced on foot, knelt down, held the Pope's stirrup, and assisted him to dismount, Adrian gave him the kiss of peace, rode with him in triumphal entry towards Rome, and received him there on June 18, 1155, a day of the month which was again to mark a great English triumph in 1815 when Waterloo was won.

Englishmen like to know that their fellow-countrymen keep a tender place in their heart for the old country amid the engrossing affairs of life in other regions, and they will turn with a peculiar and patriotic interest to the chapter which describes Pope Adrian's relations with his own country (p. 127). More than once indeed (pp. 19, 41, 151-2) does Mr. Tarleton refer to the Pope's wish that he had never left his native land. Though only once, as Cardinal Breakspear, did he ever revisit England, and no particulars of that visit are at hand, yet his nephew Boso was always with him to talk of English life, and when visitors came from England they were warmly received. Two accounts are fortunately extant which are full of interest on the reception of such visitors. One of these is in the *Chronicles of St. Alban's Abbey*, and describes how

Abbot
Henry
cruel
privile
(pp. 12
that w
of Joh
interpe
John o
that A
(p. 14)
a who
suffice
Latin
the sta
describ
the re
an ex
(p. 16)
by suc
(pp. 15
Mr. T
unbias
this di

Th
nexion
long, a
firm a
our id
and in
over S
round
who n
played
to side
two.
affairs
thwart
and o
some
spiritu
been
which
a dep
relying
VOL

Abbot Robert went upon a congratulatory embassy from Henry II. to the Pope, and took occasion to complain of the cruel oppression of the Bishop of Lincoln, and to win a special privilege of freedom from episcopal control for his abbey (pp. 127-33). The other is the most valuable personal record that we have of Pope Adrian, and is to be found in the writings of John of Salisbury, of whom Mr. Tarleton, after his manner, interposes some account (pp. 137-52). It is unfortunate that John of Salisbury mentions without comment the important fact that Adrian issued a Bull which granted Ireland to Henry II. (p. 149). This Bull has been a matter of much dispute, and a whole chapter is devoted to the subject (p. 153). It must suffice here to summarize the chapter, and to say that the Latin text and an English translation of the Bull are given, the state of Ireland in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is described, and a very fair review of the evidence is put before the reader. The result appears to be that the Bull played an extremely insignificant part in Henry's Irish policy (p. 167), although its genuineness is accepted as indisputable by such authorities as the Rev. J. Dimock and Dr. Creighton (pp. 153, 180). We must add that in no part of the book has Mr. Tarleton shown more signs of his desire to be an unbiassed and complete biographer than in the treatment of this difficult question.

The troubles which beset Adrian from the South in connexion with William II. of Sicily (p. 182) need not detain us long, and that for two reasons. In the first place, Adrian's firm and dignified behaviour towards William does not add to our idea of his character, though it undoubtedly confirms it; and in the next place the Papal claim of temporal power over Sicily is really part of the larger question which gathers round the name of Frederic Barbarossa. The Norman kings who ruled in Sicily claimed the rights of conquest over it, played off the Pope against the Emperor, and were inclined to side with the Pope as the better geographical ally of the two. Adrian's fine diplomacy was on the point of bringing affairs to a satisfactory issue with William, when it was thwarted by the German party in the college of cardinals, and on this account it was only after William had inflicted some serious blows on Southern Italy, and after the supreme spiritual weapons of excommunication and anathema had been put in force, that the Pope obtained the submission which he required. It was at this time that Adrian received a deputation of bishops from the Eastern Church, which, relying upon his reputation for justice, came to complain that

the Knights Hospitallers had abused the privileges granted to them by the previous Pope (p. 200). This little episode must be noticed in connexion with Adrian's desire to reconcile the Eastern and Western parts of the Church, in furtherance of which he had much correspondence with the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Byzantine Emperor, and which he might have done more to promote if his last few years had not been filled with stormy conflict about the temporal power (p. 201).

The friendly relations between the Pope and the Emperor Frederic were in the nature of things—as so well described by Milman in a passage quoted by Mr. Tarleton (p. 206)—liable to be disturbed at any moment. The Emperor's actions were on many occasions such as to exalt his own imperial claims and to depreciate the sovereignty of the Pope, and when some independent German knights had plundered the Archbishop of Lund with impunity, Adrian decided to interfere. His legates fairly represented the high claims of their master, and justified the confidence which he placed in them, but it seems to the outside observer as if they might have been a little more conciliatory in tone and manner. The Pope, they said, sent his greetings to the Emperor, as his father, and the cardinals claimed to be his brothers. This second claim at least, if logical, was audacious, and the legates made a further blunder when they haughtily allowed the term 'beneficia' to be interpreted in its feudal sense (pp. 212, 268), though the Pope had used it in his letter to the Emperor in the ordinary sense of 'benefits.' The indignation of the nobles of the Emperor knew no bounds, and when Roland, the senior legate, afterwards Pope Alexander III., had calmly asked of whom Frederic held his empire if not of the Pope, his life was only saved by the physical intervention of the Emperor. But Frederic was hardly less indignant than his nobles at being treated as a feoff of Adrian. He chose to misunderstand the significance of the blank documents with the papal seal attached which were found in the possession of the legates, and, riding roughshod over all considerations, he ordered them to go straight back to Rome. It was not until Adrian himself had written a clever diplomatic letter to the Emperor that a temporary reconciliation was again established between them (pp. 208–24).

When both sides made such tremendous claims no permanent peace was possible, and the Pope's charitable and domestic duties in Rome were soon rudely to be thrust aside by a bitter and final conflict with the imperial power. There were

many
contr
North
in L
chara
Matil
Sicily
the in
loyal
reserv
age f
justic
which
quest
We v
thoug
house
North
Nove
a sul
Rave
appoi
the I
encro
quiet
streng
Rome
The s
last A
for K
242).
peror
the C
by an
1159,
Amo
death
also
that,
fly: V
had r
his b
table
Frede
light,

many complicated matters which made up the sum of the controversy. On Frederic's side the political condition of North Italy, the growing independence of the small republics in Lombardy and the towns of Tuscany, the precarious character of his claim upon the estates of the Countess Matilda, and the unfriendly attitude of the powerful King of Sicily, were all causes of anxiety. On Adrian's side there were the insignificance of his temporal resources, and the doubtful loyalty of the German bishops ; but at the same time the vast reserve of spiritual weapons of which the force was in that age fully recognized, and the consciousness of the undoubted justice of his claim upon Matilda's property under her will, which must be admitted whatever view is taken of the larger question of the claim of temporal power over the Empire. We will not go into the history of Matilda's possessions, though she belongs to the ancestral history of our own royal house, nor into the military manœuvres of the Emperor in Northern Italy (pp. 225-34). But we must notice that in November 1158 Frederic appointed one of his German nobles, a sub-deacon of the Roman Church, to be Archbishop of Ravenna. Adrian courteously declined to approve of the appointment, and refused to confirm it when Frederic sent the Bishop of Vercelli to obtain the confirmation. Other encroachments and acts of cruelty followed, and Adrian quietly encouraged the North of Italy to resist the Emperor, strengthened the military posts in the neighbourhood of Rome, and wrote more than one severe letter to Frederic. The situation quickly developed into a grave crisis, and at last Adrian delivered a final claim which it was impossible for Frederic, from his point of view, to accept (pp. 241-242). Adrian therefore prepared to excommunicate the Emperor, and was on the point of putting this mighty engine of the Church into motion when he was overtaken at Anagni by an attack of quinsy, and breathed his last on September 1, 1159, having been elected Pope on December 4, 1154. Among the legends that have been circulated about his death is the usual accusation of poisoning, and a story is also told, invented it is said by the followers of Frederic, that, in the quaint words of Fuller, he 'was choak't with a fly : Which in the large Territory of St. Peter's patrimony had no place but his throat to get into ; but since a flye stopt his breath fear shall stop my mouth, not to make uncharitable conclusions from such casualties' (p. 13, cf. p. 245). Frederic comes before us for the last time in a very noble light, for although Adrian was only prevented by death from

excommunicating him, and although the sentence of excommunication was carried out by the faithful Roland who had been elected Pope while the German party put up a rival in Octavian, yet the Emperor 'desired all respect and honour to be paid at the obsequies of his staunch opposer' (p. 246), and we desire to pay him all honour in his turn for his generous chivalry.

A few details remain to be mentioned before we conclude our review of the life of the English Pope. He was, as we might expect, thoroughly versed in the English and Latin tongues; we are also told that he was accomplished in French and Norse (p. 251). By these four languages we are reminded of his nationality, his pontificate, his rule as Abbot of St. Rufus, and his work as Papal legate. His literary works are not extant, though Mr. Tarleton believes in the genuineness of an English rendering of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, which he prints on p. 254, and he is able to tell us that Adrian wrote a history of his mission to the North, catechisms for the Swedes and Norwegians, homilies, and a treatise on the Immaculate Conception. He also did much building during his short pontificate (p. 255). An account of his Bulls, and a list of the cardinals whom he created, are given in Appendix III. (p. 269).

Among a small number of errors and slips, we notice that 'deacon' is a misprint for 'dean' on p. 39, and 'throes' is spelt wrongly on p. 69. We cannot unravel a tangled sentence in the second paragraph of p. 105, and we feel sure that the title of a standard work of reference is incorrectly given on p. 260. Occasionally there is a slipshod sentence, as in the omission of the relative on p. 256, while on p. 285 the type of the last line but one is slightly disturbed.

Adrian's career up to his election to the Papacy is a conspicuous illustration of the way in which God has 'exalted the humble and meek' to the high places of His Kingdom, and when we look upon the brief but full period of his occupation of the Papal Chair, and marvel at his sudden removal from the critical scene, we are reminded of the words of the Wisdom of Solomon: 'He being made perfect in a short time fulfilled a long time: for his soul pleased the Lord: therefore hastened He to take him away from among the wicked.'¹ As we ask ourselves where we are to place him among the great names of the Christian Church, Mr. Tarleton comes to our aid and points out that in the High Altar screen of St. Alban's Abbey Adrian is placed between the Venerable

¹ Wisd. iv. 13, 14, and see verses 15-20.

Bede
fitness
with
who
was n
sovere
fully
Nichol

AR

The M
F
h
E
o
(

If it i
be inc
there
elicit
to pro
Order
recent
clergy
and a
motin
Church
that th
well as
work
design
Christ
teachi

W
but be
refer to
write.

Our

¹ Fe
i. clxi. (

² Se

Bede and St. Hugh of Lincoln. We recognize at once the fitness of the position, next to Bede who loved his country with the truest and deepest affection,¹ and next to Hugh who could stand up bravely for the King of kings when it was necessary to rebuke the encroachments of any earthly sovereign.² If ever patriotism and Christian courage were fully represented in one man, it was in the person of Nicholas Breakspear, Pope Adrian IV.

ART. VI.—LIAS'S MANUAL ON THE NICENE CREED.

The Nicene Creed. A Manual for the Use of Candidates for Holy Orders. By J. J. LIAS, M.A., Rector of East Bergholt, Colchester, Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Llandaff; Author of *Principles of Biblical Criticism, The Atonement, &c.* (London, 1897).

If it is possible that some of Chancellor Lias's readers may be inclined to question parts of his preface, the statement he there makes about the design of his new book is likely to elicit much interest and sympathy. After mentioning his wish to provide a satisfactory text-book for candidates for Holy Orders, a 'restatement of theological truth in the light of recent scientific discovery,' a manual which will supply the clergy with the 'first principles' of the 'science' of 'theology,' and a work which as an Eirenicon may be of service in promoting the restoration of the visible unity of the Christian Church (Preface, pp. iv-vi), he goes on to speak of his hope that the book may be useful to lay members of the Church as well as to the clergy (*ibid.* p. vii), and at an early point in the work itself tells his readers that 'the present treatise is designed for those who are willing to accept the teaching of Christ, but desire more information as to the nature of that teaching' (p. 27).

We have noticed many valuable features of this manual, but before we proceed to call attention to them we wish to refer to less satisfactory matters, about which it is our duty to write.

Our perusal of his book has left on our mind a very

¹ For example 'Erat doctus in nostris carminibus.' Bede's *Works*, i. clxi. (ed. Plummer).

² See the late Archdeacon Perry's *Life of St. Hugh of Avalon*.

uncomfortable feeling of doubt whether Chancellor Lias is sufficiently equipped for the task he has undertaken. There are signs with regard to historical accuracy and patristic knowledge, to clearness of thought, and to power of interpretation which suggest that in each of these important respects the author is not fully equal to the requirements of so great a work as his combined objects demand. The apparent distinction between the 'Patripassian' and the 'Sabellian' heresies, and the description of the former as teaching that 'the Father became incarnate' (p. 125, note 2), do not inspire confidence.¹ The repeated emphasis on the unanimous character of the Council of Nicæa (p. 127) does not convey the idea that the author realized the exact facts at the time when he wrote.² The statement that St. 'Cyril of Alexandria' 'is the only Eastern Father who at all approximates to the language of the West' on the subject of the Procession of God the Holy Ghost (p. 256) is not consistent with the existence of passages in the writings of St. Athanasius³ and St. Basil,⁴ and in a Creed preserved by St. Epiphanius,⁵ which certainly contain approximations to the Western phraseology. To say that 'in 589 King Reccared of Spain' 'inserted the words *Filioque*' 'in his copy of the Nicene Creed, and caused it to be recited thus at the celebration of the Holy Com-

¹ Patripassianism is simply a Western name for the Sabellian heresy, regarding it from the point of view that if there are not three Divine Persons, but only three manifestations of one Person, it would logically follow that He who in one method of manifestation is the Father in another method of manifestation suffered on the Cross. That 'the Father became incarnate' is rather the logical inference drawn by opponents of the heresy than the teaching of the heresy itself.

² It is, of course, true that the Council of Nicæa was almost unanimous, and we might have passed by without comment Chancellor Lias's phrases in the text 'unanimously resolved,' 'this unanimity.' But when he directs special attention to them in a note, and emphatically repeats 'the decision was *unanimous*,' it is necessary to remember that Theonas, Bishop of Marmarica, and Secundus, Bishop of Ptolemais, persisted in refusing to accept the Creed; and that the eventual withdrawal of a similar refusal by Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, Theognis, Bishop of Nicæa, and Maris, Bishop of Chalcedon, was not regarded as a sincere act. And the note to which we have referred does not give a just idea of the discussions which preceded the acceptance of the Creed.

³ St. Ath. *Expos. fid.* 4; *Orat. c. Arian.* i. 15; *Ep. ad Serap.* i. 2, 20, 32, iii. 1. See also *De Trin. et Spir. Sanc.* 19, where, though the Latin text in which alone the treatise exists may have been amplified, it is unlikely that the teaching on this point is an actual addition; and *De Incarn. et c. Arian.* 9, which, if not by St. Athanasius, is at any rate Eastern.

⁴ St. Basil, *De Spir. Sanc.* 46.

⁵ St. Epiph. *Ancor.* 121; cf. *ibid.* 6; *Adv. Hær.* lxii. 4.

munic
what a
'reason
Apost
copies
few in
on the
Confir
the gi
baptiz
of him
tion a
passag
teachi
dents
Sacram
withou
of Ny
(p. 41)
teachi
and th
than '

: T
imply t
the 'C
acts of
and the
about t
² Se
13-19,
³ Ch
separat
tion ap
bishop.
Quartes
⁴ Se
Euchar
⁵ Se
Euchar
⁶ In
versalis
spirits
resurr.
dicts th
⁷ Th
be here
and fou
heretica
'Theod
Review

munion' (pp. 256-7), is not an accurate representation of what appear to have been the facts.¹ The assertion that the 'reason' why the 'witness of the' 'Churches founded by the Apostles was invariably appealed to in early days' 'was that copies of the Scriptures were at that time, for various reasons, few in number' (p. 294) is altogether contrary to the evidence on the subject.² The statement that 'in the Western Church' Confirmation 'has been wisely deferred, on the principle that the gift in Baptism cannot have its perfect work until each baptized person has taken the step of conscious self-dedication of himself to God' (p. 315), appears to rest upon a misconception about the history of Confirmation in the West.³ Another passage seems to imply ignorance or forgetfulness of ordinary teaching within the Roman Church with regard to the 'accidents' in the Eucharist⁴ and the supra-local character of the Sacramental Presence of Christ⁵ (pp. 326-7). To assert without qualification that 'such eminent divines as Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia were Universalists' (p. 417, note 1) is misleading in view of the facts that the teaching of the former on this point was self-contradictory,⁶ and that the latter came to be notorious as a heretic rather than 'eminent' as a 'divine.'⁷ On some minor matters it is

¹ The language used at the Council of Toledo of 589 A.D. appears to imply that the Creed was recited in the form already known in Spain as the 'Creed of Constantinople' without any intentional addition. The acts of the Council are given in, e.g., Hard. *Concilia*, iii. 467-90. This and the instance previously noticed are not the only cases of inaccuracy about the history of the Creeds.

² See St. Irenæus, *C. Hær.* i. ix. 3-x. 1; Tertullian, *De præscr. hæres.* 13-19, 36.

³ Chancellor Lias writes as if he supposed that the Western Church separated Confirmation from Baptism by a deliberate act. The separation appears to have arisen simply from the difficulty of access to a bishop. There are some useful references on this subject in the *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1886, pp. 71-2.

⁴ See, e.g., St. Thom. Aq. *S. T.* iii. lxxvii. 6; De Lugo, *De Sacr. Euchar.* Disputatio x.

⁵ See, e.g., St. Thom. Aq. *S. T.* iii. lxxvi. 5; De Lugo, *De Sacr. Euchar.* Disputatio v.

⁶ In some passages in his writings St. Gregory of Nyssa asserts Universalism of a complete kind which includes the devil and the subordinate spirits of evil as well as man; see *Catech. Orat.* 26, 35; *De anima et resurr.* But the teaching in *Adv. eos qui differunt Baptismum* contradicts this opinion.

⁷ The teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia was expressly declared to be heretical by the Fifth Œcumenical Council in its twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth anathemas: see Hard. *Conc.* iii. 197-202. The essentially heretical character of his views was fully treated in the article entitled 'Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought' in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1875.

not satisfactory to find a thought of St. Augustine referred to as if it had been originated by the modern writer Godet (p. 175);¹ the idea of a well-known utterance of St. Bernard ascribed without further reference to Dr. Milligan (p. 231);² and the phrase 'extension of the Incarnation,' which Bishop Jeremy Taylor used to summarize the patristic view of the work of the Church by means of the Sacraments, spoken of as if it was due to the accomplished and learned author of the *Bampton Lectures* for 1891 (p. 283 note 3).³

In the matter of clearness of thought we are gravely dissatisfied with the treatment of certain terms sometimes used as descriptions of God (pp. 52-3),⁴ and with the references to the doctrine of grace (pp. 142, 272),⁵ the teaching of Apollinaris (p. 149),⁶ and the 'merely negative view of moral evil' (p. 185);⁷ while we are of opinion that a clear thinker, with adequate theological and historical knowledge, ought not to accept 'Mr. Matthew Arnold's' 'phrase' 'as a kind of "magnified and non-natural" Roman Emperor' as a 'felicitous' description of the mediæval and modern Western way of regarding God (p. 50).⁸

In matters of interpretation we may illustrate what we mean by the statements that Abraham was 'tortured by an anxiety lest the "Judge of all the earth" should not "do

¹ St. Aug. *De Trin.* i. 21; *In Joan. Ev. Tract.* cxxiv. 6.

² St. Bernard, *In die Pasch. Serm.* 14.

³ Jeremy Taylor, *Worthy Communicant*, i. 2.

⁴ What was needed was not the mere rejection of the terms 'the Absolute,' 'the Infinite,' 'the Unconditioned,' but an explanation in what senses they are true and in what senses they are untrue.

⁵ An accurate theological use of the phraseology 'habitual' and 'actual grace' is not at all inconsistent with the retention of the 'Scriptural' 'conception' 'of the perpetual indwelling of Christ in the human heart through His Spirit.'

⁶ It would have been much more satisfactory to state exactly that Apollinaris asserted the existence of the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in our Lord, but denied the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\eta$ or $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, than to say inaccurately 'Apollinaris' 'taught that the Godhead supplied the place of the human soul and spirit of Jesus; and then add in a note, 'Apollinaris conceded a kind of $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ to our Lord.'

⁷ It is true enough that St. Augustine and some of the schoolmen exaggerated the negative character of evil. But Chancellor Lias does not appear to recognize the profound truth which underlay their teaching—namely, that evil is always a perversion of good. This truth is thoroughly patristic and Catholic: see, e.g., St. Athan. *C. Gentes*, 6, 7; St. Basil, *Quod Deus non est auctor malorum*, 6; St. Aug. *Enchir.* 12, 13, 23, 24; St. John Dam. *De fide Orth.* ii. 4, 12; St. Thom. Aq. *S. T.* i. xlviii. 1, 3; xlix. 1-3, ii. lxxv. 1.

⁸ It is worth while to refer to a very acute and historically true criticism on a similar misconception about the thought of the Middle Ages in Pullan, *Lectures on Religion*, pp. 333-4.

right
'grav
(*ibid.*
Ruler
human
son Is

W
is ag
Prote
lation
not ex
he say
'thoug
capabl
of Pers
or abso
Elsew

'T
torial
i Cori
His m
one of
access
Human
of Chr
up in t
though
God, c
myster
opinion

And i
'It
arrived
need to
that we

W
to the

¹ Th
had a s
a fixed

² It
Gen. xx
words a
lation fr
tested th
and pain

right" at the time of his pleading for Sodom (p. 81), had 'grave doubts whether' God was 'in truth a just' 'Being' (*ibid.* note 2),¹ and that it was a 'doubt whether this Mighty Ruler and Judge might not require to be propitiated by human sacrifice' which led him to be willing to offer up his son Isaac (pp. 81-2).²

When we turn to the doctrinal teaching of the book there is again much to which exception may rightly be taken. Protest is needed against an unfounded and dangerous speculation towards which the author inclines, but which he does not expressly make his own. 'The manhood' of our Lord, he says,

'though "taken into God," remains true manhood still, though capable of infinite growth and development, by reason of the "unity of Person," until, it may be, it ultimately becomes co-extensive with, or absorbed into, the Divine' (p. 166).

Elsewhere he writes—

'The only conclusion to which I can come is that Christ's mediatorial kingdom shall then' (*i.e.* at the time of 'the end' spoken of in 1 Corinthians xv. 28) 'have come to an end; in other words, that His mediation, as Man, will no longer be necessary, but that each one of the redeemed shall enjoy the blessed privilege of immediate access to God, by reason of the completeness with which Christ's Humanity has been inwrought into theirs. What shall have become of Christ's Manhood in that Day—whether it shall be at last swallowed up in the Majesty of Godhead, or whether it shall continue to exist, though it be no longer necessary as the medium of our approach to God, or whether it is destined ultimately to coalesce, in some mysterious way, with our own—it were presumptuous to express an opinion' (pp. 252-3).

And it is stated—

'It would appear that when the time of restitution of all things has arrived, we shall no longer, as in this life, and even as in Paradise, need to approach God through the medium of His Incarnate Son, but that we shall thenceforth "see Him as He is" in Himself' (p. 427).

We recognize that there is room for differing opinions as to the way in which the Blessed shall behold God in the

¹ The right interpretation of Gen. xviii. 25 is surely that Abraham had a strong conviction of the justice of God, and, taking that justice as a fixed point, appealed to it.

² It seems to us impossible to take the words ascribed to God in Gen. xxii. 1-2 as being a 'doubt' which 'haunted' Abraham, and the words ascribed to the angel of the Lord in xxii. 11-12 as a 'special revelation from above.' The natural interpretation of the chapter is that God tested the faith of Abraham by calling on him to do what was strange and painful.

eternal future life, and as to the right interpretation of St. Paul's mysterious saying that 'the Son also Himself' shall 'be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all.'¹ But we cannot see how a strong hold either on the truth of the Incarnation or on the realities of the spiritual life is to be maintained if it is supposed that the Manhood of Christ has no eternally permanent existence. The personal union in the Incarnation implies that, as the Manhood can never be divided from the Godhead, so also it can never be absorbed. The real existence of the Humanity is precious to men not only in the time of their probation, or in the preparation for the future glory which the Intermediate State affords, but also throughout eternity. The context shows that St. John's words, 'we shall see Him as He is,'² refer to the Second Person in the Holy Trinity; and the vision of Him which the Blessed shall possess throughout their eternal happiness would fail in part of its joy if they did not behold the Nature in which He redeemed them and through which He has communicated to them their union with his Godhead and the means of their sanctification. And if the speculation which Chancellor Lias regards somewhat favourably has no philosophic or spiritual attraction it certainly is without authority. We do not know of any evidence by which it could be supported from Holy Scripture or Catholic tradition, while there is very much in both which is inconsistent with it. The comparison of our risen life with that of our Lord, which has so prominent a place in the teaching of St. Paul,³ naturally leads on to belief in the eternity of His Human Nature. The Revelation of St. John speaks of the Lamb as an eternal guide and temple and light in Heaven.⁴ In the Epistle to the Hebrews the High Priesthood which our Lord exercises is represented as being in some sense an eternal Priesthood.⁵ Christian thought has continuously regarded Him as eternally the Son of Mary. Amid all the varying interpretations of the words about the subjecting of the Son, the one fixed point is that they cannot mean that the Manhood of Christ shall cease to exist. To Origen⁶ and the Gregories⁷ and St. Cyril of Alexandria⁸ and St. Chrysostom,⁹ not less than to St. Ambrose¹⁰ and St. Hilary¹¹ and

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 28.² 1 St. John iii. 2.³ 1 Cor. xv. 20-3.⁴ Rev. vii. 17, xiv. 1-4, xxi. 22, 23.⁵ Heb. vi. 20, vii. 17, 21, 24.⁶ Orig. *In Psal. xxxvi. Hom. ii. 1.*⁷ St. Greg. Naz. *Orat. xxx. 5*; St. Greg. Nyss. *In Illud, Quando sibi subjecerit omnia*, passim.⁸ St. Cyr. Alex. *Thesaurus*, 29.⁹ St. Chrys. *In Joan. Hom. xi. 2.*¹⁰ St. Ambr. *De fide*, v. 13, 14.¹¹ St. Hil. *De Trin. xi. 36-40.*

St. Je
well a
that t
united
destro
alike,

Th
results

'involv
this po
evil its
no evil
There
for wh
witness
ment o
happin
which t

So, a l

'Th
the exis
evolutio

And, a

'Th
the Fall
and for
this need

Th
necessa
world f
because
he had
so.

Th
of thou
that m

¹ St.³ St.

4 ad 1.

⁴ St.⁵ Th

it is uni
cessatio
writers a
increas

St. Jerome¹ and St. Augustine,² to St. Thomas Aquinas³ as well as to St. John Damascene,⁴ it is an inconceivable thought that the Human Nature which the eternal Son of God united unto His Divine Person shall ever be abandoned or destroyed. Eastern and Western, Father and Schoolman alike, can find no place in their theology for such an idea.⁵

There is an error, scarcely less likely to be fruitful in evil results, in the teaching about sin. 'Temptation,' it is said, 'involves a state of things in which evil necessarily exists. From this point of view the Fall appears to us as a moral necessity, and evil itself as a stage in the development of good. For, were there no evil, all the higher forms of goodness were impossible . . . There is no scope, in a world where sin and suffering are unknown, for what we call *noble* actions . . . Our moral constitution bears witness to the fact that evil is no more than a step in the development of the race—a term in the series whose sum is the ultimate happiness of mankind—a factor in the problem, by the solution of which that happiness is attained' (pp. 67-8).

So, a little later, we find the statement—

'The existence of evil, supposed by some to be incompatible with the existence of the Perfect Good, is in reality necessary to the evolution of the highest kind of goodness' (p. 77).

And, again, further on, it is said—

'The more we insist on the doctrine of evolution, the more probable the Fall becomes. Given a being inheriting animal characteristics, and for the first time endowed with a capacity for transgressing, and this necessity becomes more strongly marked than ever' (p. 187).

Thus Chancellor Lias asserts that the Fall of man was necessary in two ways—firstly, because sin was needed in the world for the development of human character; and secondly, because the constitution of man's nature was such that, when he had the opportunity of sinning, he could not help doing so.

The first of these considerations is founded on a confusion of thought. The need of the possibility of sinning in order that man may be proved is a different thing from a supposed

¹ St. Jer. *Ep.* lv. 5.

² St. Aug. *De Trin.* i. 15.

³ St. Thom. Aq. *In Ep. i ad Cor.* cap. xv. lect. 3; cf. *S. T. I.* xlii. 4 ad 1.

⁴ St. John Dam. *In Ep. i ad Cor.*, on xv. 25-9.

⁵ The significance of the passages to which we have referred is that it is uniformly asserted or assumed that there is no indication of any cessation of the existence of the human nature of our Lord. The list of writers and the references to those we have mentioned might be largely increased.

necessity that the first man should actually sin or that subsequent men should have the defect and taint of original sin.

The second consideration ignores facts it is vital to remember. The rebuke of Adam and Eve by God, and the punishment inflicted by Him on them and their posterity, are not compatible with a theory that they had only done what they could not help doing. Whatever the fascination of sin may or may not have been to a being who had as yet no experience of it, there must be placed side by side the power for goodness in a nature into which nothing evil had yet come, which had been created in the image of God and had received the gift of moral likeness to God. The tremendous consequences of Adam's sin are morally explicable only when it is remembered that it was the one human sin which has been committed in a nature into which the bias towards evil had not come. If the first three chapters of the book of Genesis teach religious truth at all, they teach that in unfallen man there was close spiritual union with His Creator, and that his Fall was not a necessity, but a grave offence.

We are compelled to criticize also some parts of the treatment of the doctrines of the Church and the Sacraments. The statements on the subject of Holy Baptism are by no means satisfactory.

'Catholic theologians,' it is said, 'have' 'been accustomed to see in Infant Baptism not only a declaration of the Will of God to save and sanctify the soul of the infant thus brought to be admitted into Christ's Church, but an actual conveyance of the powers without which such salvation and sanctification would be impossible. But such conveyance of the necessary powers has never been regarded as absolute, but merely *potential*.'¹ That is to say, it is the Will of God that the Divine gift of salvation shall be placed within the reach of every soul, without exception. But the extent to which that gift becomes the actual inheritance of each individual soul will be in precise proportion to the extent to which that soul realizes its possession of it' (p. 173).

'We see that these promises made in Baptism are conditional, first on our *acceptance*¹ of them, and next on our resolution to *use* them. The power to use them comes from God. Without His help we cannot even stir hand or foot to help ourselves. But Baptism is a proclamation of His willingness to give us the help of which we stand in such sore need ; in fact, it tells us that the power is actually conferred upon us, and that all we have to do is to use it. In other words, our co-operation with the power of the Life of Christ,

¹ The italics are the author's.

impart
results

'In
the pro
Christ,
potenti
regard
on God
gift its
the Div
But th
will, th
Withou
tive, an
mately

No
some p
means
that hi
been re
necessi
case, w
than h
pressio
'necess
'merely
at leas
larly ob
union v
Holy C
absolut
this co
nothing
received
acts res
sins of
the 'ch
fail to
forfeit
there is

Nor
Holy E
his own
Human
Pusey's
to be de

imparted to us by the Spirit, is necessary in order to obtain the results such a power is able to work in us' (pp. 309-10).

'In the case of the infant, the Christian society is content with the promise that the child shall be taught to reverence and follow Christ, and instructed in the nature of the gift which it has at least potentially received. But both the infant and the adult are alike in regard to the gift of the Life from on high. That gift is as absolute on God's part to the one as to the other. In neither case is the gift itself contingent on faith. In each case it is the expression of the Divine Will, which has willed the salvation of the whole world. But the gift once given, the intelligent co-operation of the human will, through the medium of faith, is required to make it effectual. Without this, the gift of the new and higher Life will remain inoperative, and will, if the recipient persist in his disobedience, be ultimately withdrawn' (pp. 314-5).

Now there are indications in these passages, and also in some passages which we have not quoted, that Chancellor Lias means to assert the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and that his anxiety is lest it should be thought that all who have been regenerated in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism will, of necessity, be ultimately among the saved. If that is the case, we have no hesitation in saying that much greater care than he has taken was needed to make this clear. The expressions that the 'conveyance of the' 'powers' which are 'necessary' for obtaining 'salvation and sanctification' is 'merely potential' (p. 173), and that the baptized infant 'has at least potentially received' 'the gift' (p. 314), are particularly objectionable. The gift of regeneration, the sacramental union with the Humanity of Christ, the reception of God the Holy Ghost, the possession of the Baptismal 'character' are absolutely bestowed upon the soul in the Sacrament. About this communication of supernatural gifts from God there is nothing potential. Nothing can make the person who has received them cease to be a member of Christ. His righteous acts rest upon the powers of his Baptism. His sins are the sins of one who, amid whatever defilement, possesses always the 'character' of the baptized. The fact that by sin he may fail to produce the true fruits of Baptism, and may at last forfeit the inheritance of eternal life, does not imply that there is anything of a 'potential' character in the gift itself.

Nor can we commend the language that is used about the Holy Eucharist. The author leaves us in doubt as to what his own belief is with regard to the Presence of the Sacred Humanity in the consecrated elements. His note on Dr. Pusey's work (p. 335, *n.* 1) on the Real Presence leaves much to be desired. It is perhaps true that Dr. Pusey in his great

catena printed many passages from the Fathers of which it was only true that they might be the outcome of belief in the Real Presence, and that if the list had been limited to instances which could not mean anything else it would have been greatly reduced. But when all allowance is made for such considerations, it remains true that a consensus of patristic teaching from all parts of the Church testifies to a universal Christian belief that in the consecrated elements of bread and wine there is present the Sacred Humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ. And while Chancellor Lias asserts plainly enough the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, it does not give confidence in his doctrinal attitude about it to find him saying—

'There is a special fitness, moreover, in the teaching of God's Word, that it is Christ's *Death* which is presented here below, His *Life* which pleads for us in the courts above. For *here* the Church is militant; *there* her Head stands at God's Right Hand triumphant. *Here* the Church is suffering; *there* her Head dwells in joy and bliss unspeakable. *Here* we are struggling to free ourselves from the dominion of sin by the Virtue of the Adorable Sacrifice; *there* the Lamb, once sacrificed, stands above all created things, presenting the Life in which Sacrifice is now consummated in Victory, and Majesty, and Glory' (pp. 241-2).¹

Holy Scripture certainly speaks of Christians showing forth the Lord's Death.² But in it our Lord speaks also of a 'memorial of me.'³ Thus the Eucharist is the presentation not only of the Death of Christ, but also of Christ Himself. It is the living Christ coming to dwell in us at Communion who enables us to struggle 'to free ourselves from the dominion of sin.' It is Christ, risen and ascended, having passed through death into glorious life, whom we offer to the Father. The traditional language of Christian worship, East and West, testifies to the strength of the Church's conviction that it is not only Christ's Passion and Death, but also His Resurrection and Ascension that are in mind, as He Himself is the Sacrificial Victim whom we present. To speak of His Death as presented on the earthly altar, and His Life as pleading in heaven, is to risk a separation between the Sacrifice of the Church and the Heavenly Offering of our Lord, which would be altogether destructive of the true doctrine of the Eucharist.

Nor is the teaching on the subject of Absolution satis-

¹ The italics throughout this passage, as in all our quotations, are the author's.

² 1 Cor. xi. 26.

³ St. Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

facto
act
'pow
mini
The
view
exper
to po
ways
truth
Hims
merit
remit
advice
tion fi

W
cast o
tion t
hardly
such a
St. Ig
with t
to sup
writing
as dis
assert
tullian
be right
in orde
When
some
byters
addition
limited
condem
he did
case ha

¹ St.
Ad Smy
² Heg
³ St.
⁴ Ter
consider
(p. 355) t
be succes
⁵ Lan
⁶ Gor

factory. It is argued that because the 'presbyter' 'can but act ministerially, as commissioned by Christ,' therefore the 'power inherent in the Church,' and 'given to each one of her ministers,' 'can only be declarative in its nature' (p. 367). The practice of Confession is considered from the point of view of the value of 'the private ministrations of a wise, experienced, and truly earnest clergyman,' who 'will be able to point out mistakes, to suggest remedies, and in a thousand ways to speak peace to the troubled soul' (pp. 368-70). The truth is that through the ministrations of the priest Christ Himself actually communicates to the penitent soul the merits of His death, so that by His Blood its sins are remitted; and what is sought in Confession is not primarily advice, however useful that may sometimes be, but Absolution from sin.

We fail to find historical ground to support the doubts cast on the necessity of Episcopal Consecration and Ordination to preserve the Christian Ministry (pp. 349-60). It is hardly true to say that 'the earliest evidence' in support of such a necessity is 'a passage in Cyprian' (p. 349). While St. Ignatius does not expressly connect the need for Bishops with their work of consecrating and ordaining, it is reasonable to suppose that this was one reason of a necessity which his writings show him to have regarded as sacramental as well as disciplinary.¹ If Hegesippus² hardly does more than assert a fact, there are passages in St. Irenæus³ and Tertullian,⁴ both of earlier date than St. Cyprian, which cannot be rightly interpreted except as asserting the need of Bishops in order to maintain the Apostolical succession in the Church. When it was contended by Dr. Langen that the Churches in some parts of the West were governed by colleges of presbyters (p. 351), he meant by presbyters who had received, in addition to the powers of the second order, the powers now limited to Bishops.⁵ When Canon Gore abstained from condemning this theory (pp. 356-7) he expressly stated that he did so on the ground that the presbyters would in such a case have received episcopal powers.⁶ Neither of these

¹ St. Ignat. *Ad Eph.* 5, 20; *Ad Trall.* 7; *Ad Philad.* 3, 4; *Ad Smyrn.* 8.

² Hegesippus ap. Eus. *H. E.* iv. 22.

³ St. Iren. *C. Hær.* iv. xxvi. 2, 5.

⁴ Tert. *De præscr. hæc.* 32, 36, 41. When these passages are considered together, it may be seen that Chancellor Lias's attempt (p. 355) to avoid the significance of the first of them cannot be held to be successful.

⁵ Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, i. 95-6.

⁶ Gore, *Mission of the Church*, pp. 29-32. Chancellor Lias does not

writers, then, can rightly be claimed as doubting the necessity of the existence and retention of the episcopal powers. The method of their exercise is a wholly different question from the fact of the possession of them.

Indeed, we could wish that the whole idea of the Church which Chancellor Lias puts before us were less confused. There is no clear teaching on the objective unity which consists in the common possession of the one Life of Christ as distinct from the subjective unity of intercommunion.¹ It would be difficult to justify the statement that

'no doctrine, however widely received, no practice, however general, can claim to be Catholic—i.e. *universal*—and therefore binding on the conscience of a Christian man, unless it has been expressly taught, enjoined, or practised by the apostles of Christ. And we have no other means of ascertaining what was originally so taught, enjoined, or practised, but the Christian Scriptures' (p. 290).²

The views expressed as to the fallibility of the Church (pp. 387-400) would naturally lead to doubt whether the decisions of the Œcumenical Councils are entitled to all the respect which Catholics have habitually paid to them, and we notice that the author evades the question whether these decisions may ever be reversed by saying 'it will be time enough' 'to discuss' 'whether it is possible for the Church to review' them 'when her members call upon her to do so' (p. 395). Moreover he fails to grasp the true significance of the maxim '*Quod semper*,' or the connexion between discipline and doctrine, or the relation of local Churches to the whole Church (pp. 387-400).

appear to have grasped the significance of a passage in the long quotation he makes from Canon Gore's lectures. That Canon Gore's meaning was as stated above is made clear when he says, 'Now if the order of presbyters at any time held the right to ordain, that was because it had been entrusted to them by apostolic men. It no more disturbs the principle of apostolic succession than if your lordship ordained all the presbyters in this diocese to-day to episcopal functions. There would ensue a great deal of inconvenience and confusion, but nothing that would violate the principle of apostolic succession. On the other hand, the departure from this principle is manifest when presbyters in the sixteenth or subsequent century took upon themselves to ordain other presbyters. They were taking on themselves an office which, beyond all question, they had not received, which was not imparted to them in their Ordination' (*ibid.* pp. 31-2). And that Canon Gore's opinion is distinctly opposed to Chancellor Lias's contention may be further seen in the former writer's *The Ministry of the Christian Church*; see especially pp. 344-5.

¹ It is, however, right to say that, while the two forms of unity are confused, the objective unity is recognized: see especially pp. 288-9, 301.

² Without entering upon the innumerable questions which this statement brings up, we should like simply to ask Chancellor Lias on what he bases the obligation of keeping Sunday.

We
that th
(pp. 423
of proba
to imagin
also on
and the
life, on t
by our l
the Bibl
the wor
the par
inference
Liturgie
prayers
can tell
to have
His just
in the ex
unerring
rather th
issues of

We h
will not
attitude
contrary,
able valu
ways it
The vali
vindicate
ment of
wise stat
the Book
the weak
repudiati
tial natur

¹ Our l
impassabl
that if the
no other o
Lias (p. 42
contrary to
verse 26, an
a Lap. in lo

² The p
are for thos
probation o

VOL. XI

We regret exceedingly the suggestion of the possibility that the probation of the soul may not end at death (pp. 423-5). The belief that the present life is the only time of probation does not rest simply, as Chancellor Lias appears to imagine, on 'a single passage in Ecclesiastes.' It rests also on the profound sense which pervades Holy Scripture and the Fathers of the importance of the decisions of this life, on the representations of the Day of Judgment spoken by our Lord Himself, on the entire absence of anything in the Bible or in Catholic theology to support another view, on the words put by our Lord into the mouth of Abraham in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus,¹ and on the inferences which may be drawn from the practice of the Liturgies and the teaching of the Fathers with regard to prayers for the departed.² He who knows what is in man can tell even from a life which to our imperfect sight seems to have been no probation at all what is the decision which His justice and mercy may rightly determine. We do well in the existence of real perplexities to put our trust in the unerring wisdom and perfect goodness of Almighty God rather than to devise speculations which disguise the true issues of life and death.

We hope the criticisms which it has been our duty to make will not lead any of our readers to think that our general attitude towards this book is one of condemnation. On the contrary, we recognize very much in it which is of considerable value. The teaching on 'faith' (pp. 15-25), if in some ways it might well be supplemented, is distinctly helpful. The validity of the appeal to miracles and prophecy is vindicated (pp. 75-6). We have observed excellent treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity (pp. 91-102); a wise statement on the interpretation of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis (p. 108); an acute and just remark on the weak points of 'German criticism' (p. 138); a needed repudiation of the possibility of 'any change' 'in the essential nature of God in consequence of His taking the Man-

¹ Our Lord represents Abraham as saying both that there is an impassable barrier between the saved and the lost (St. Luke xvi. 26) and that if the opportunities afforded by the Providence of God are not used no other opportunities would be (*ibid.* 31). We observe that Chancellor Lias (p. 421) assumes that Dives was not among the lost. This view is contrary to the general texture of the parable, to the express words in verse 26, and to the traditional interpretation of the passage: *v. Corn. a Lap. in loc.*

² The prayers used in the Liturgies and commended by the Fathers are for those whose salvation has through Divine grace been won in the probation of this life.

hood' 'into Himself' (p. 157), and of various ideas connected with the 'kenotic' speculations which have become popular (pp. 160-5);¹ an excellent illustration of the doctrine of Justification (pp. 178-9), with a valuable statement on Predestination and Election (pp. 179-80); a useful summary with regard to the Papacy (pp. 381-7); and some opportune remarks on the Resurrection (pp. 408-10).

And, since we have commented on what we think imperfections in the teaching about the Church, we desire to quote the following passage as one with which we entirely agree, while we wish that the principles involved in it had been more consistently carried out in other parts of the work:—

'Before leaving the question of the Œcumenical Councils and their decisions, it may be well to say a few words on the functions of the Church in developing the doctrine which Christ has commissioned her to disseminate. It must not be supposed that there is any infallibility attaching to the decisions of a General Council as such. As we have already seen, those decisions, when promulgated, were almost invariably fiercely, and for a time successfully, challenged. Their binding nature consists in the fact of their ultimate acceptance by the vast majority of the members of the Christian Church. That acceptance was, no doubt, followed by the exclusion of the minority from the pale of Catholic Christendom. But unless this exclusion had been a *just* exclusion we may be quite sure that the logic of facts would have compelled the majority to abandon their attitude. The best justification for the action of Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Flavian, Theodoret, and Leo is the *disappearance*, more or less complete, of the doctrine of their antagonists from the face of the earth. We conclude therefore that the general consent of Christians at large, and not the mere verdict of Councils, is the principle on which the dogmatic teaching of the Church is based.

¹ Some notice of a passage on p. 164 is called for. Chancellor Lias there attacks the statement of Dr. Bright (*The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, p. 299) that in the Incarnation our Lord 'divested Himself of' 'that unreserved exercise of Divine prerogatives which would be incompatible with the acceptance of the limitations attaching to humanity as He was to assume it,' and appears to think that it differs materially from his own assertion that 'it was impossible, in the very nature of things, that' the Divine 'prerogatives could be manifested, or even exercised in their fullness, in and through the Manhood' (p. 165, n.) We are confident that Chancellor Lias has misunderstood Dr. Bright, and that the meaning of the latter's words is simply that the Son of God voluntarily restrained the exercise of the Divine powers which He continuously possessed. This is shown by pp. 291-2 of the same work (a passage referred to with approval by Chancellor Lias in his note on p. 161), and also by Dr. Bright's *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 333, n. 1 ('an actual surrender of Divine prerogatives or perfections by a Divine Person is unthinkable'), and *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 393 ('As a rule, He held in reserve, by a continuous self-restraint, the exercise of Divine powers').

'A
The d
than p
claim
ments.
that th
of the
down i
that if
held, n
two sep
other;
not str
altogeth
or they
was nei
pounde
under f
154-6).

Th
tains
ful tho
the circ
and cle
tionabl
think i
parison
or ever
It lack
ing of
unfortu
grasp o
harmon
a whole
to the
likely t
for who
sources
to exer
conditio
sufficient
factory
rity of
Eirenic
of great
We

'A further consideration tends to strengthen this conclusion. The dogmatic decisions of the early Church were rather negative than positive. They were intended to exclude error, not to proclaim new truth. They were *danger signals* rather than developments. It was found, by actual experience, that if it were taught that the Godhead of the Son was not identical in Essence with that of the Father, the whole Christian scheme, as it has been handed down in Scripture, collapsed in a moment. So again it was found that if the doctrine of the One Person of Christ were not firmly held, men came to believe, not in the Word made Flesh, but in two separate beings, one of them more or less closely united to the other; while, on the other hand, if the two natures of Christ were not strongly insisted on, the true manhood of Christ disappeared altogether, and men either regarded it as absorbed into the Godhead, or they conceived of a being who, subsequently to the Incarnation, was neither God nor man, but a kind of intermediate being compounded of the two. But the Christian scheme is only conceivable under the hypothesis that "God and Man is one Christ" (pp. 154-6).

This new work on the doctrines of the Nicene Creed contains much that is useful. It may suggest lines of fruitful thought. It is in some ways calculated to be helpful in the circumstances of the present time. By greater accuracy and clearness, and, above all, by the removal of some questionable opinions, it could be greatly improved. We cannot think its respected author was well advised in inviting comparison with Bishop Pearson's work on the Apostles' Creed, or even with Dr. Mason's *Faith of the Gospel* (Pref. pp. iv-v). It lacks the accuracy, the method, the robustness, the learning of the former of these books. If it is free from one or two unfortunate features of the latter, it is without the general grasp on Catholic truth and the great merit of showing the harmony and consistency of the Christian Faith regarded as a whole system which marked Dr. Mason's work. To recur to the various objects mentioned in the preface, the book is likely to be of value to candidates for Ordination, the class for whom it is primarily intended, if they obtain from other sources a clear knowledge of doctrine which will enable them to exercise discretion in their study of it. Under the same conditions it may help some of the clergy. It has hardly sufficient grasp on the great principle upon which alone satisfactory reunion can take place, the acceptance of the authority of the Universal Church, to make it fitted to be an Eirenicon. Most of the laity, we think, will find other books of greater service to them.

We may add that we are certain that the time has not

B E C

yet come when either candidates for Ordination or the younger clergy can afford to lay aside the great treatises of Bishop Pearson and Richard Hooker. They may call for patience and require thought, they may sometimes need explanation and comment from a living teacher; but, as the products of master-minds, they have the power of impressing great principles on those who study them rightly and of teaching lessons, often little realized at the time of perusal, which may be of permanent value for the whole of life.

ART. VII.—ST. CATHERINE OF GENOA.

1. *Acta Sanctorum Bollandi*: Mensis Septembris, tom. v. (Antverpiæ, 1755.)
2. *Vita mirabile e Dottrina santa della beata Caterina Fiesca Adorna*. Da GIUSEPPE BOTTARI. (Genova, 1667.)
3. *Les Œuvres de Ste Catherine de Gênes, précédées de sa vie*. Par le Vte. M. T. DE BUSSIERRE. (Paris, 1860.)

IN a recent number of this *Review*¹ an account was given of St. Catherine of Siena. It is possible that some of our readers may be glad to compare with her another saint, who, bearing the same name, and partaking of the same holiness, presents a singular contrast to the prophetess who rebuked a Pope at Avignon.

Exactly a century had elapsed since the birth, at Siena, of the more eminent Catherine when Catherine Fieschi was born, in 1447, at Genoa. It is probable, though we know of no evidence on the point, that she was named after the earlier saint. The daughter of the Sienese dyer, Benincasa, becomes a Dominican nun, is deeply absorbed in politics in their religious aspect, travels from place to place in furtherance of a peace to be founded on repentance and righteousness, stands like a conscience before the Pope at Avignon, and stings him to return to Rome, where she herself dies, worn with stress and travel, at the age of thirty-three. The daughter of the Genoese noble is thwarted in her desire of entering an Augustinian convent, is forced into an unhappy marriage, never apparently leaves her native city, and never alludes to its political vicissitudes, spends a long life in ministering to the sick in a hospital, and dies after many years of excruciating disease at the age of sixty-three.

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1897.

Th
not ac
was a
more t
1458),
France
France
fall int
the Ad
marrie
of sixt
mitted
France
for thi
Charle
impote
when
two ye
of Fra
years l
which
a heav
her city
transiti
but suc
with w
in Cath
change
The
astical
election
who en
the pap
who ca
a last c
succeed
in her t
acknow
promise
he seen
success
life from
phantom
She liv
stantino

The absence of political interest in the later Catherine is not accounted for by her lot being cast in quieter times. She was a girl of eleven when Genoa, which had been subject for more than a century to the house of Visconti at Milan (1353-1458), cast off their yoke and submitted to Charles VII. of France. Three years later (1461) the city revolted against France and restored her republican institutions, but only to fall into the misery of constant feuds between the Fregosi and the Adorni, into which latter family Catherine was unwillingly married two years later, when she had hardly reached the age of sixteen years. The following year the city again submitted to Milan in the person of the great condottiere, Francesco Sforza, and remained subject to his degenerate family for thirty years, when Ludovico il Moro opened her gates to Charles VIII. of France, and she became the base of his impotent yet important invasion of Italy in 1494. In 1499, when Catherine was fifty-two years of age and a widow of two years, Genoa, led by the nobles, submitted to Louis XII. of France in his assumed capacity of Duke of Milan. Eight years later the reluctant people rebelled and set up a republic, which lasted less than a month before it was suppressed with a heavy hand by Louis. Thus, during Catherine's lifetime, her city passed under eight forms of government; and such transitions were not in those days easy and peaceful changes, but such as filled the streets with blood and the hospitals with wounded men and starving children. Yet there is not in Catherine's writings a single allusion to any of these changes, or to the misery which accompanied them.

The same silence is observed with respect to the ecclesiastical history of her time. Her birth coincides with the election, and her first eight years with the reign, of Nicolas V., who ended the last papal schism. Her girlhood passed under the papacy of Calixtus III., the first Borgia, and of Pius II., who canonized the Sienese Catherine, and strove to promote a last crusade. In her eighteenth year the morose Paul II. succeeded; in her twenty-fifth year the Caligulan Sixtus IV.; in her thirty-eighth year Innocent VII., who, to provide his acknowledged sons with money, sold sacraments and broke promises, deceiving the people as he had deceived God. Yet he seems almost innocent indeed when compared with his successor, Alexander VI., whose eleven years cover Catherine's life from the age of forty-five to that of fifty-six. After the phantom pope of a month succeeded the warrior, Julius II. She lived through such events of interest as the fall of Constantinople (1453), the introduction of printing into Italy

(1465), the discovery of America by her countryman (1492), the preaching and death of Savonarola (1489-98); in 1492 she must have been a spectator of the death, in the harbour of Genoa, of such hosts of Jews, exiles from Spain, that their corpses infected all the Italian coast with pestilence; but of none of these things does she say a word. She does not mention her family, her marriage, her husband's death. Yet all this time she was not leading a sequestered life in a cloister. For several years she occupied a place in the noblest society of Genoa. She was afterwards, as we should say, matron of a large hospital; she was constantly engaged in works of mercy outside its walls; she was sought as adviser by numbers of men and women. To these and other occupations, and the events with which they brought her into contact, she hardly gives a word. A friend has told us how, during a slow day's journey up the Nile, the boat moved by the side of an Arab who all day long uttered the cry of 'God! God!' St. Catherine's absorption reminds us of this ascetic. Her one concern was to describe, as she apprehended it, the manner in which God was purifying her for Himself.

At first sight we may be disposed to censure her for her indifference to the world around her. And if it is pleaded in her defence that the Gospel is equally empty of the details of secular history, the answer is ready that the Gospel tells enough of the history of the world to fix the chronology of our Lord's life, and is full of details of the working, wondering, stumbling world, of which we find not one in Catherine. But then it must be remembered that St. Catherine's books are not a general biography of her, but a record of a certain (the most important) aspect of her life; and that human frailty is not to be blamed if it sees in part and prophesies in part. We would yield to none in emphasizing the sacredness of daily life, the illustration of God's providence in history, the danger lest absorption in our own spiritual concerns should make us forget the world which surrounds us and depends on us. But we must in justice remember that Catherine's absorption was concurrent with the most noble service of the sick and miserable.

It is singular how little reference she makes to most of the articles of the Creed, and to the Sacraments. She alludes but once, we think, to Holy Baptism, to Penance, to the Holy Eucharist, never to Confirmation; yet we learn from her biographer how, during an interdict, she walked a mile outside the town for her daily communion, and 'her desire to unite herself with her Beloved was so great, that it seemed as

if her
she mi
the Sai
appare
regret
learned
from th
which
by rule
St. Cat
she cou
blame
should
which v
but it
vivid p
reveal
of the
not and

Litt
study h
by her
Life in
with so
brought
M. de F

The
one of t
(Innoc
It was
privileg
façade,
parties
the rem
the inva
Guelfic
was at
like her
the Eas
consequ
navigati

¹ Such
the basis
translated

² Act

if her body reached as quickly as her soul the place where she might find Him.' She does not speak of the Pope, or of the Saints, or even of the Blessed Mother of our Lord. She apparently knew little of Holy Scripture, and we cannot but regret that she missed the wholesome breadth of life to be learned from the Gospels, the balanced truths to be gathered from the Epistles, the varied aspirations of the Psalms, with which she would have been more familiar had she been bound by rule to the daily recitation of the divine office. But if St. Catherine found almost all the revelation of God which she could apprehend in the secret of her heart, she does not blame those who find a revelation of Him elsewhere; nor should she be blamed because she pursued a singular path to which we are not called. No doubt her religion is one-sided, but it is genuine; and we may be thankful to her for her vivid presentment of grace as a reality, of God as willing to reveal Himself to His children, and of man's mind as capable of the highest exercise when we 'see God for ourselves, and not another.'

Little as she tells us of her outward life, it is yet best to study her spiritual experiences in the light of the facts recorded by her disciple, a layman, Ettore Vernaccia, who wrote her Life in concert with her director, C. Marabotto,¹ together with scattered statements elsewhere, which are admirably brought together in the Life prefixed to his translation by M. de Bussierre.

The family of Fieschi to which Catherine belonged was one of the most illustrious in Genoa, and had given two Popes (Innocent IV. in 1243, and Adrian V. in 1276) to the Church. It was one of the few families which enjoyed the singular privilege of ornamenting their palaces, like the cathedral façade, with bands of black and white marble. Of the two parties which divided mediæval Italy—the one derived from the remains of the old Latin civilization, and the other from the invading Germans—the Fieschi belonged to the Latin or Guelfic party. At the time of the saint's birth, in 1447, Genoa was at the height of her magnificence, soon to be reduced, like her rival, Venice, by the strife of factions, by the fall of the Eastern Empire, and by the diversion of commerce in consequence of the discovery of America and the circumnavigation of the Cape. The biographer of Catherine,² though

¹ Such is the judgment of the Bollandist, U. S., who uses this Life as the basis of his Commentary. He inserts also an anonymous Life, translated from the Acts of her canonization.

² *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. 15, p. 130.

he tells us how contemptible are bodily charms, dwells with some detail on her beauty—her tall, graceful figure, her balanced head, her oval face, her regular features, her splendid hair and long black eyelashes, the height and purity of her brow. But from an early age she despised the advantages of beauty and wealth. A faultless childhood was marked by singular habits of prayer, and a desire to share the Passion of the Lord. At the age of thirteen Catherine urgently desired to enter a convent of Augustinian nuns, the *Madonna delle Grazie*, of which her elder sister was already a member, and won the consent of the director of the community, but not that of the nuns, who, with all their regard for her, would not break their rule to admit so young a novice. Their decision was no doubt as wise as their rule; but it says something for the reality of the child's vocation that her disappointment led to no prejudicial reaction. She had already learned that sanctity consists in conformity with the will of God, whether in the cloister or in the world; and at a later time she repudiated with fire the suggestion of a Franciscan that in the religious state she might have loved God better than in married life.

For no other life than this was imposed on her. Her parents seem to have been God-fearing people, who put no obstacle in the way of their elder daughter becoming a nun; but her father was now dead, and her brother, anxious to strengthen the Guelph party in opposing Paolo Fregosi, bandit, pirate, archbishop and doge, was determined to attach to it Giuliano Adorno, a Ghibelline, but an enemy of the Fregosi, by a marriage between him and Catherine. The girl had hoped that in a few years the way would be made plain for her to enter a convent; but she submitted, sorely against her will, to marry a man who was violent in temper, dissolute, and a gambler. The marriage took place on January 13, 1463. Giuliano, who had no affection for his wife, continued his reckless course till he had wasted all his fortune and that which Catherine brought him, and persecuted her for her austerities. It is impossible not to pity both parties to this unsuitable marriage. His wife's singular devotion was naturally irksome to the gay young noble; and it is possible that a good woman of a less exalted type might have won him to better ways. It is true that in the end Catherine's gentleness and prayers led to his repentance before his death in 1497.

The first five years of her married life were spent by her in great misery. She abjured society, she fasted, she spent

nights
all her
her th
her ha
own r
ran in
pable.
supple
her co
journe
that e
spiritu
love (J
the Sc
When
loses I
involv
conspi
tepidi
treat
difficu
for the
impos
life les
which
Christ
eating
St. Ma
He m
consis
might
yet fre
Cather
or ind
ledge
be diff
on the
the sp
who u
very li
are lik
of the
takers
man, u
Bu

nights in watching before the crucifix, she grew so thin that all her beauty was lost. Then, when her friends persuaded her that such a course of life was really suicide, she changed her habits, entered society, and associated with ladies of her own rank. There is not a suggestion in her works that she ran into any excess which would seem to most people culpable. At this point in her life the narrative of her friends is supplemented by her three books of Dialogues, which are really her confessions. In the first book of these she speaks of a journey on which Soul and Body set out together, agreeing that each should enjoy the delights that attracted it, whether spiritual or natural; and, in case they should disagree, Self-love (*Amor Proprio*) should accompany them as umpire. When the Soul leads, the Body rebels, and enlists on its side Self-love. When the Body leads, the Soul is continually dragged down, loses her heavenly tastes, and lives in constant dread of being involved in further compliances. Her fall was not into any conspicuous sin, but from conspicuous holiness, a fall into tepidity and laxity which so easily happens, which so few treat seriously, and from which the recovery is often so difficult. It would ill become us to censure so genuine a saint for the remorse with which she viewed this lapse; yet it is impossible not to wish that she had regarded the conduct of life less from the standpoint of an ideal, and more in the light which is thrown upon it by the example of our Lord Jesus Christ. He who began His ministry at a feast, who 'came eating and drinking,' who accepted the bodily ministrations of St. Martha, who was content to interrupt His meditation that He might serve the Samaritan woman, and did not find inconsistent with His love for all men a special love for some, might have taught her that it is possible to live in the world yet free from its evil. But there is nothing to indicate that Catherine was in the habit of meditating on the Gospel history, or indeed was generally familiar with it. Her practical knowledge of it seems almost confined to the crucifixion. It would be difficult to speak warmly enough of the value of meditation on the whole life of the Lord Jesus as the method whereby the spiritual life may be made broad and equable. Those who use books of devotion instead of the Gospel may find very likely nothing that is not true in their books, but they are likely to find only one aspect of truth; and the purpose of the Christian life is not only that we may be made partakers of Christ's death, but that we may come 'unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'

But while we regret St. Catherine's apparent lack of

familiarity with the 'life of our Life,' we must not forget that liberties which are wholesome for some persons are dangerous for others. She was one who felt strongly a vocation to the religious life, which she only renounced under compulsion. To her the ordinary amenities of life, not rejected by our Lord, nor generally forbidden to His disciples, were incongruous. She was not made to be a lady of rank. No doubt she felt rightly that social life was wrecking her spiritual life. Each of us is only capable of reproducing ever so dimly a portion of Christ's character; and that Catherine could not imitate the Guest at Cana should not dim the praise that she could and did imitate the Sufferer in the Garden.

The end of the tenth year of her married life found her in the deepest distress. She had not won her husband, and she seemed to have thrown away her soul. On the eve of St. Benedict (March 20), 1474, visiting the church of that saint, she begged him to procure for her an illness of three months, feeling, as so many have felt, that the compulsory retreat of a sick-bed was her only way of 'recovering her breath.' The following day her sister Limbania urged her to consult the director of the Augustinian nuns, a priest of great enlightenment and holiness—whether the same who had sympathized fourteen years before with her desire for the religious life we cannot say. After some hesitation she sought this priest and asked him to receive her confession; but as she took her place, a ray of heavenly light, disclosing for a moment the work of the Lord Jesus Christ in her as well as her miserable want of love, robbed her of all power of speech. The priest, supposing her to be occupied with preparing her confession, left her for a time, and returned to find her still silent. At last she contrived to ask leave to defer her confession; she rushed home, shut herself into her room, cast off the ornaments of secular vanity, and plunged into the contemplation of her own sinfulness and of the preventing love of God. Then she received a vision; our Lord appeared, bearing His Cross, covered from head to foot with blood. 'Seest thou this blood?' He said; 'it was shed to the last drop for love of thee, and for satisfaction for thy sins.'¹

This was the beginning of her conversion and of the divine communications by which she was sustained. We use the indefinite term 'divine communications,' for it is not clear whether they usually took the form of visions. It is perhaps most likely that they were of the nature of sudden and pungent realizations of spiritual truths—less like visions than

¹ *Dial.* i. 11.

that su
a fami
living
stage
unable
that '
speak,
her ill

'Lo
myself
exchan
canst b
myself
indwell
feeling,
so abso
with m

The p

'At
away, a
shed in
pleasur
world.'

The vi
'her m
respect
tained

St.
that o
she se
her rep
made
langua
the ha
reache
order
convic
of mar
man is
really
he ma
which
the sul

that startling insight of which most of us are conscious, when a familiar truth bursts through its shell and displays itself as living and life-giving. In this way she was led from one stage of penitence to another. She often professes herself unable to give words to her inward experience. 'She perceived that 'the Self [*questo Essere del huomo*] of fallen man is, so to speak, no less bad and malignant than God is good ;' that her ill could have no remedy but in the Lord.

'Lord,' she said, 'I give myself to Thee, for I perceive that by myself I can but make of myself a hell. I propose to Thee an exchange : I put into Thy hands my malignant being, for Thou canst bury it in Thy goodness, and so rule me that nothing more of myself may be seen in me. Do Thou on Thy side give me the indwelling of Thy pure love, so that it may quell in me every other feeling, may cause me to be annihilated in Thee, and may keep me so absorbed that no strange thing may find time or place to dwell with me.'

The proposed exchange was accepted.

'At that moment the malignant part of her memory was taken away, and she had no more anxiety about it ; while a ray of love was shed in her heart which . . . took away from her every love, appetite, pleasure, possession, which she had ever had, or could have, in this world.'

The view of herself no longer caused her any pain, for 'her most merciful God had taken away from her all affliction in this respect ; yet she saw clearly what she was, and how the Lord sustained her.'¹

St. Catherine uses the language of devotion rather than that of accurate theology. In her abasement of humanity she seems almost to forget that it is still God's creature ; in her repudiation of selfhood she hardly bears in mind that God made men Selves—personal, self-conscious, originative. The language of depreciation of man may be misused to depreciate the handiwork of God. Ten years after the period we have reached was born one who, after entering the Augustinian order which Catherine desired to enter, was led by his intense conviction of sin to push to its logical extent the depreciation of man which we are noticing in her. According to Luther, man is so debased by the Fall that he can never do things really pleasing to God ; all that he can hope is that by his faith he may have imputed to him the righteousness of Christ which can never be his own. Faith, in the new theology, is the substitute for good works really pleasing to God, not the

¹ *Dial.* i. 12.

root out of which such works may grow. Our saint indeed was no Lutheran before Luther; she never doubted that God desires men to be, and not only to be accounted, righteous. Yet her extreme depreciation of man may seem to cloud in some way the filial relation of man to God—to represent human personality as that which God will not sanctify but annihilate. Although our danger may be rather from undue self-estimation than from undue self-depreciation, yet it is well to bear in mind that a saint is not necessarily infallible, and that St. Catherine's language is more fervent than accurate.

Though God had 'taken away from her all affliction in respect of' her past sins, she conceived herself directed by Him (she had at this time, and for long after, no human director) to mortify the flesh by wearing a hair shirt, by praying six hours daily on bare knees, by mixing bitter powders with all she ate till the sense of taste was destroyed. Her eyes were ever cast down: 'she had always the mien of grief, yet she was very happy.' She tried to rob herself of sleep by putting sharp things into her bed; but 'whatever she did, God never deprived her of sleep; she slept though she would not.' It does not seem to have occurred to her to question whether God's refusal to use one of her proposed means of mortification suggested that the other means which she adopted were less divinely prompted than she thought.

Meanwhile, her Humanity (for so she called the lower element in herself, or rather perhaps her Self regarded as striving to be independent of God) murmured and longed for death. Once indeed, after Communion, she had a happy moment in which soul and body alike seemed to be in heaven, and she grasped the meaning of the Psalm, 'My heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God.' But she thought herself guided to pray that such moments should not be repeated, lest she should seek for happiness, whose true end was to seek for God alone by pure love.¹

Soon after her conversion, apparently in 1475, she joined the ladies of the Misericordia in their charitable work of seeking out the poor and sick in the hovels of which even now Genoa contains not a few; and she also visited the lazaretto for the incurable poor. Before long she was led to occupy a house within the precincts of the hospital; for her husband had dissipated his fortune and hers, so that they were reduced to live on alms. This is one of the very few incidents in her life to which she alludes.² Their loss turned to their gain, for Giuliano became penitent, entered

¹ *Dial.* i. 14.

² *Ibid.* i. 19.

the T
his w
the r
distre
on hi
1478
a pos
and f
pain
She w
she fo
incom
led?
degre
brigh
of it
matro
'malig

'S
gain d
more.
mann
for I s
comes

W
Dialo
conce
not th
God,
a wor
satisfi
suffer
The s
not se
recur
them
the s
which
flesh
asund
precis
philos
is cor

the Third Order of St. Francis, and associated himself with his wife in her works of charity; but his violent temper, and the resentment with which he bore sickness, continued to distress her for the remaining twenty years of his life; though on his death-bed he received the gift of patience. About 1478 Catherine was appointed matron of the great hospital, a post which she was directed by the Divine Voice to accept, and filled with great success, though it brought her much pain from the rudeness and indolence of the paid servants. She was probably even more distressed by the pleasure which she found in her work. Was it not a sort of 'accidental love,' incompatible with the pure love by which she aspired to be led? But this pleasure was only given her in a limited degree; it aided her humanity in doing the necessary work brightly and well, but when the work was done the memory of it passed away.¹ She regarded her promotion to the matronship as a test whether, at the call of popular praise, her 'malignant part' would revive.

'She did her work very quickly, and never rested, in order to gain distraction from the fire which every day besieged her more and more. . . . Then the Spirit, who had governed the Humanity in this manner, said, "Henceforth I will no more call her a human creature, for I see her all lost in the Lord, and find nothing in her which comes from the purely human principle apart from God."'²

With these words she closes the first book of her Dialogues. A hasty reader might think her in great peril of conceit of her own holiness; but her prevailing thought is not that she had attained to any degree of sanctity, but that God, without her co-operation for the most part, had wrought a wondrous work in her. She was, we conceive, no more self-satisfied than St. Paul was when he recounted his labours and sufferings, and said, 'By the grace of God I am what I am.' The second book is far more difficult to understand. It does not seem to follow the first in a chronological order. She recurs to the earlier moments of her conversion to describe them from another point of view. Hitherto the contrast and the strife have been between the soul and the humanity, which is equivalent to the body, or, in St. Paul's phrase, the flesh: now the Word of God pierces 'even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit.' It would be vain to look for any precise distinction between these two: Catherine is not a philosopher but a saint; but, like the holiest of women, she is conscious that there is a distinction—that, while the soul's

¹ *Dial.* i. 21.² *Ibid.*

office is to 'magnify the Lord,' the spirit's condition is to 'rejoice in God the Saviour.' God, the Spirit, draws her spirit into Himself, where it is buried. The soul, inseparable from the spirit, follows it, and is in a way partaker of the bliss of the saints, but without knowing it, because it surpasses formal knowledge. The body, having no longer any understanding, memory, or will for the things of this world, yet being incapable of spiritual pleasure, stands outside both worlds in a state of dubiety and torment. It can only cry like a hurt beast: it suffers, not knowing why it suffers. The soul, too, pleads that once it had great peace and joy in God, but now it is bare and spoiled of all; yet it is satisfied to be so spoiled; all its powers have found their rest in God; it knows not, yet is content to be ignorant.¹ Then a ray of Divine Love filled the soul, and even refreshed the body, as if they were already in Paradise.² Such raptures are intermittent and partial: the soul perceives that God 'cannot but love that which He hath created,' but what this pure love is she cannot yet understand; she must wait in peace.³ She must wait in peace. Meanwhile God makes the body a purgatory for the soul. She must learn that all she has yet performed—penances, alms, fasts, prayers—were duties to which she was obliged as a servant; she has not yet attained to real virtue, which is not the performance of obligations, but the service of perfect freedom—that is to say, of perfect love.⁴ It would seem as if the saint had been assailed by some movements of self-complacency, which had to be eradicated by this instruction.

The spirit then undertakes the instruction of the soul. It recalls how, in the old days, it had been cruelly treated by the soul, being excluded from its true place in God. Now it will, in glorious revenge, treat the soul with the like cruelty, exclude it from all it loves, make it empty and bare, subject it to a long and irremediable martyrdom, teach it what it is to be separated from the spirit. The soul had long been filled with the works of God, filled with His goodness, as it were in Paradise; but she has taken some of the credit to herself. Now she must be excluded from all this joy, that she may know that in herself she is nothing; she must wait awhile outside the gates within which the spirit is shut up in God.⁵

Such was the saint's position for many years. At times what she calls a 'correspondence' was permitted between

¹ *Dial.* ii. 1, 2.

² *Ibid.* ii. 4.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 5.

⁴ *Ibid.* ii. 8.

⁵ *Ibid.* ii. 9.

spirit
unity
God,
But n
pains,
conte
pose
pure
was n
plete.
life sh
at lea
God's
fectio
under

T
of Di
durin
till C
remo
to ha
suffer
to the
fire o
spicu
ledge
subtle
those
world
earth
other
tingu
the le
woul
her r
consi
and h
expr
state
is sh
remi
the s
out i

spirit, soul, and body—that is to say, by a realization of the unity in which they were created, the joy of the spirit, hid in God, was reflected in the soul, and even sustained the body. But more frequently the body was filled with purgatorial pains, in which the soul was required to dwell (and to dwell content) in an increasing darkness and ignorance of the purpose of God; while the spirit was buried in the secret joy of pure love. The cries of the soul were taken to show that it was not yet fully surrendered to God, nor its purgation complete. A hope was held out to the humanity that when its life should be consumed it should be less conscious of pain, or at least of the fearful anticipation of it. But the work was in God's hands, and in His alone. He had undertaken her perfection, and would leave her no share in it, not even the understanding of His work.¹

The dates which fix the chronology of the second book of Dialogues are the twenty-five years after her conversion, during which she remained without a director (1474-1499), till C. Marabotto was appointed to that office, and his removal after ten years, in 1509).² His absence seems to have been brief, though it was the completion of her suffering. The third book of the Dialogues seems to belong to the last year of her life, 1510. Not only is the seraphic fire of the earlier books to be traced here even more conspicuously, but we find in the last book a deeper self-knowledge, a humility more oblivious of self. We may trace a subtle touch of this latter virtue when she says³ that those who 'bear within them Paradise' are very rare in this world; if they were known they would be worshipped upon earth; but God keeps them unknown to themselves and to others, even to the hour of death, when the true will be distinguished from the false. To have used such words with the least suspicion that she was one of these singular ones would have been an excess of arrogance; to be ignorant of her rank among them was supreme humility. The third book consists chiefly of colloquies between the soul and her Lord, and has something of the nature of retractations. Here she expresses with more caution what had been more broadly stated elsewhere. For instance, her forgetfulness of the past is shown⁴ not to have excluded a partial and occasional reminiscence of it; and the sole work of God in sanctifying the soul by pure love leaves room for the penitent soul to cast out its imperfections. 'Thou art so efficacious,' she cries to

¹ *Dial.* ii. 11.³ *Ibid.* iii. 10.² *Ibid.* ii. 10.⁴ *Ibid.* iii. 8.

the Divine Love, 'so illuminative, that Thou drawest out of the hidden depths of our hearts all our imperfections, and settest them before our eyes, in order that we may remedy them and purify ourselves of them.'¹

The treatise on Purgatory differs little in essence from the Dialogues, for the latter work describes as carried out in Catherine upon earth the same work of purgation which with other persons is perfected after death. Hers is no mediæval purgatory whose grotesque penalties could hardly be lifted to sublimity even by the pen of Dante. There is no suggestion of indulgences shortening the time, or mitigating the severity, of a soul's suffering. In this connection it may be noticed that Catherine herself would never avail herself of Papal Indulgences, nor would she even beg the prayers of others, with the intention (we suppose) of seeking relief from pain.² She knew too well, what modern Rome no less than modern Protestantism too often forgets, that the Christian's hope and the promise of the Gospel is the remission of sins, and not the remission of their penalty. She would place herself in the hands of God, and not try to evade the least part of the penalty she deserved.

'Not one farthing of the payment is remitted to the souls in Purgatory, for it has been ordained on God's part to satisfy eternal justice. And if alms, shortening the time, are made for them by their survivors in the world, they cannot turn to regard these alms with affection, save as subject to the just scale of God. They yield themselves to God in everything, and He pays Himself as pleases His infinite goodness.'³

She begins her treatise abruptly :

'The souls in Purgatory (as I seem to understand) could have no choice to be elsewhere than where they are. They do not regret that for having committed such and such sins they are there : they cannot say, This or that soul will pass out earlier than I. They have, neither for good nor for bad, any memory of their own which works in them an increase of affliction ; but are so content to be at the disposal of God that, amid their sharpest sufferings, they cannot think of themselves. . . . They see one single time, at the moment of passing from this life to another, the cause of the Purgatory which they have in themselves : thenceforth they see it no more, lest there should be self-will (*una Proprietà*) in them. . . . There is no contentment to be compared with theirs but that of the saints in heaven ; only the soul's rust (*ruggine*) of sin, which prevents it from the clear vision of God, causes an agony which is never diminished till the

¹ *Dial.* iii. 4.

² *Acta Sanct.* p. 163 ; De Bussierre, p. 116.

³ *Purg.* chap. xiii.

rust in
awakes
like tha
not infi
flicted
sinner
by way

The so
rush w
find th
know i
surpass
of sin i

'by a su
for ther
all, it w
that G
operatio

Such, i
in this
torial w

'My
greater
find it,
understa
lose all

Th
rine's t
in deta
her late
1497.
director
Cattane
graphy;
publica
sons for
rible ;
said by
and the
to frequ
ness'
Boerio,

¹ P

² L

VOL.

rust is burned away. As the "beatific instinct" (*instinto beatifico*) awakes in a soul it creates a fire which is, in all but the guilt of sin, like that of hell. Hell itself, though interminable in continuance, is not infinite in intensity of pain. God might with justice have inflicted far heavier penalties; and to be out of hell would be for the sinner far worse torment than to be in it; for at least he is in God by way of justice.¹

The soul would find a thousand hells more tolerable than to rush with the least imperfection into the presence of God. To find that the soul has in itself things displeasing to God—to know its many offences against infinite Goodness—this pain surpasses all others; and therefore God gives the knowledge of sin in only a small degree, and

'by a supreme act of love He works without man's co-operation; for there are in the soul so many imperfections that, if it saw them all, it would live in despair. . . . It is only when they are annihilated that God shows them to the soul, that it may learn the divine operation wrought in it by the fire of love.'²

Such, in a condensed form, is the teaching of St. Catherine in this treatise. She concludes by showing how this purgatorial work is accomplished in her:

'My contentment is that God be satisfied; and I could find no greater torture than to depart from His ordinance, so just do I find it, and accompanied by so great goodness. . . . Finally, let us understand that God, most good and most great, causes man to lose all that is of man, and that Purgatory purifies us.'³

Thus we have tried to describe the contents of St. Catherine's two works. Before we proceed to discuss some points in detail it may be well to mention the few external facts of her later life which are recorded. Her husband died in 1497. In 1499 Catherine, who had been without a human director for twenty-five years, was allowed to find one in Cattaneo Marabotto, who, after her death, wrote her biography, and assisted her disciple, Ettore Vernaccia, in the publication of her works. She was sought by many persons for counsel and help. Her bodily sufferings were terrible; her flesh was consumed by a burning fever, which is said by her assistants to have heated the vessels she touched and the water with which she was washed. She was subject to frequent ecstasies, which she herself called simply 'giddiness' (*vertigines*). A celebrated physician, Gianbattista Boerio, who thought her illness imposture, declared his ability

¹ *Purg.* chap. i., iv., and vii.; compare *Dial.* i. 8, and iii. 13.

² *Ibid.* chap. xi.

³ *Ibid.* chap. xvii.

to cure her; her friends urged her to submit to his treatment, and for a moment she allowed herself in a hope of recovery, for which she suffered an access of purgatorial pains. The physician owned himself defeated and mistaken. About the same time she suffered intensely from the absence, apparently for only a few days, of her director. On August 26, 1510, God showed her in a vision her soul wholly divested of carnal and spiritual affection—not, of course, of the pure love of God which she had so long practised and coveted. On September 14, the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, she seemed to revive a little. Shortly after midnight she was asked if she desired to receive the Blessed Sacrament. Her daily Communion had been, for years, her one joy; and whenever it was perforce intermitted, she suffered acutely in body as well as mind. But on this last day of her life on earth it seemed as if she had passed beyond the need even of that holy sacrament, for it would appear that she did not receive it, but pointing to heaven, as if expected there, and breathing the words, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit,' she passed to the immediate enjoyment of that Love which she had sought so eagerly for thirty-six years.

Her sanctity was at once recognized by the people, and was supposed to be guaranteed by the usual miracles. Shortly after her death she was beatified by her compatriot, Pope Julius II. She was canonized by Clement X. in 1675.

We have given, together with an account of St. Catherine's life, a description of her books, not pausing to discuss her views, though our silence must by no means be taken for universal assent. To criticize the words of one who has lived very close to God is a task from which we shrink. Such a person is like a traveller who has penetrated a strange land: we may sometimes think that he misunderstands what he saw there, but after all he has been there and we have not. Yet we should fail to do our duty if we refrained from offering a few remarks on three points which seem to us of great practical importance: we mean (1) Catherine's teaching as to the relation of the body to the soul, (2) her teaching as to suffering as satisfaction to God, and (3) her teaching as to the operation of Divine Grace without man's knowledge or co-operation.

(1) Not content with distinguishing between body and soul, St. Catherine seems to regard them as two entirely separate beings, only coupled by a sort of accidental bond. The 'correspondence' between them is sometimes renewed,

but of
while t
and fre
is not.
were so
argue i
accurse
are tim
its resu
her Cat
testant
vesture
dones f
near th
thing m
and dig
beauty
it from
cannot
one inst
which s
matters,
her disg
taste of
was it n
its natur

It is
Catherin
chemical
teeming
nard tha
be unpa
For us t
denial, b
deed wel
that bod
They st
assumpti
alive and
Yet whil
rialism w
being, th
but must

(2) T

but oftener broken. The body complains¹ that it suffers while the soul rejoices, though the soul, possessing reason and freewill, is capable of sinning, which the irrational body is not. It does not seem to occur to her that, if the body were so separate from the soul and so irrational, it could not argue its cause. She treats the body as an enemy, as an accursed thing, as a mere burden on the spirit; though there are times when (taught by the Creed) she looks forward to its resurrection and felicity. In this respect she is saved by her Catholic faith from the manicheism which, in some Protestant mystics, makes the body no more than a 'muddy vesture of decay,' a temporary prison-house, soon to be abandoned for ever; yet we cannot but think that at times she is near this error. Is the body, with its senses and tastes, a thing merely to be hated and crushed? Has it not a worth and dignity from God who made it, endowed it with its beauty and powers, provided it with instincts which protect it from danger, and subjected it to laws which, being His laws, cannot be violated without temerity and loss? Let us take one instance from the saint's life. To overcome the loathing which she, like other nurses, felt at the sight of certain matters, she forced herself to swallow the thing which caused her disgust. But if a thing is revolting not to the pampered taste of a few, but to the natural bodily instinct of every man, was it not a sort of presumption to force upon the body what its nature so prompted it to abhor?

It is true that the science of hygiene hardly existed in Catherine's time. Even the learned knew nothing of the chemical value of foods, and the germs of disease which are teeming in corruption. It is not to be blamed in St. Bernard that he fed on beech-leaves, knowing them indeed to be unpalatable, but not knowing them to be unwholesome. For us to adopt such a diet would surely be not lawful self-denial, but suicidal disregard of God's laws of health. It is indeed well for us to be reminded by the austerities of such saints that bodily life and health are not the chief concern of man. They startle us into a dutiful criticism of the prevalent assumption that the first duty of man is to keep his body alive and well, even at the cost of luxury or perhaps of sin. Yet while we learn to repudiate this ignoble doctrine of materialism we must not forget that the body is, in our complex being, that which needs to be subdued and taught to serve, but must not be trampled on as an enemy.

(2) The second point in Catherine's doctrine on which we

¹ *Dial.* i. 16.

have to remark is the way in which she regards suffering as satisfactory to God. It is stated in her *Life*¹ that after fourteen months of severe penance which followed her conversion God revealed to her that she had abundantly satisfied His justice. This view of the satisfactory character of suffering is indeed no peculiarity of hers, but is common to many, both Catholics and Protestants: with this great difference, that, whereas Catholics believe that the satisfaction of God is wrought by the suffering of the penitent himself, united to Christ, the Protestant supposes that it has been once for all accomplished by the sufferings of the Saviour on the cross, so that no more is demanded of the sinner than that he should believe in the payment of his debt. There is, no doubt, an element of truth in both views. It is true, as all generous minds feel, that the sinner *ought* to suffer—that he at least, if not God, can only be satisfied by submitting to his penalty. It is true also that the love of God, supremely displayed by the death of the ‘Son of His love,’ allows not the extreme penalty to fall on those who believe in Him, and that the union of Christ with us gives such potency to suffering shared with Him, that our cleansing is proportioned not to the amount of our suffering but to the grace which purges us through it. But it may be feared that language such as that to which we have referred has done double harm. It has led some (though not St. Catherine) to suppose that by merely bearing certain penalties we can pay the last farthing of our debt, and claim forgiveness as a right; and others (again not our saint) to think harshly of God, as if He desired the death of the sinner, and could take pleasure in his agony.

The debt which we owe to God is not our pain, but ourselves, made for His glory. It is a debt which we are bound to pay, not because we have sinned, but because we are His. That which really satisfies Him is not our suffering, but the obedience which we learn, the cleansing which we acquire, through suffering. He can only be satisfied with the hearty self-surrender of those whom He has made and loves. Christ on His cross made a perfect satisfaction for our sins, because He made our suffering, which He bore to the full, no longer mere suffering, but effectual discipline and purgation.

(3) We turn to the third element in St. Catherine's teaching on which we purpose to comment—the operation of God's grace without the knowledge or co-operation of man.

We suppose that, without the use of technical expressions,

¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, p. 154; De Bussierre, p. 49.

the g
after t
some
are en
first m
when
effectu
welcom
operat
uses i

TH
dicted
it a fu
certain
His o
acquire
have
inflict
which

In
lays d
world,
we lea
for ma
very c

‘so cru
commi
than a
which
damag
clear k
been o

This
realiza
sins w
resolv
do for
adhere
it wer
becaus
taken
over, a
from h

the general sense into which Western belief settled down after the controversies of the sixteenth century may be stated in some such terms as these. In the salvation of man two factors are engaged—the grace of God and the will of man. The first moment indeed comes from God alone, who loved us when we had no love for Him. But His grace only becomes effectual when, approaching man's will, it is discerned and welcomed. From that point the two factors work in co-operation: God gives grace, man recognizes, accepts, and uses it.

That this statement is mainly true is no more contradicted by St. Catherine than by ourselves. But she adds to it a further statement which is less familiar: that, beyond a certain stage, God takes the whole matter of salvation into His own hands, leaving for man no part but that of simple acquiescence; removes the memory of past sins, so that we have no further need to lament or to eradicate them; and inflicts pain without enlightening the soul as to the causes for which it is sent.

In estimating her doctrine we must not suppose that she lays down her own experience as the rule for all men in this world, though it may be in the world to come; nor must we leave out of sight the very real place which she provides for man's will. The work of salvation began in her with a very clear revelation of her past sins. She was

'so crushed and swallowed up in the sight of the sins which she had committed against God, that she was more like a frightened beast than a reasonable being. This came from the clear knowledge which had been given her of the gravity of her offences, and of the damage proceeding from them, so that, if she had long retained this clear knowledge, her body would have been consumed, even had it been of diamond.'¹

This self-knowledge was accompanied by an equally vivid realization of God's goodness. 'She began to confess her sins with so deep a contrition as was wonderful.'² She resolved to submit herself to God and to all that He might do for her; and this resolution, made once for all, was adhered to all through her life. She speaks indeed as if it were impossible for her ever to turn back from it, not because of any fixity of her own will,³ but because God had taken possession of her will and emptied it of self. Moreover, although the detailed memory of past sins was taken from her, the deep conviction of her sinfulness remained;

¹ *Dial.* i. 12.² *Ibid.* ii. 3.³ See *Dial.* ii. 11.

nor indeed was the remembrance of sins so entirely removed¹ as some earlier passages would lead us to suppose.

God, then, taking into His own hands the entire conduct of her soul, sent her a multitude of afflictions which she was not allowed to connect with special sins as the penalty which they deserved. She could not say, 'This pain reminds me of such an act which I must confess with more sorrow, rectify with more zeal, and avoid with more prudence.' But she submitted to the pain as the necessary and right dealing of Infinite Mercy with a sinner who was being restored to union with Him.

This unconsciousness of hers puts us on our guard against what may be called a practical semi-pelagianism. We have escaped from the falsehood of supposing that man's will apart from God's grace can find salvation; but we are still in danger if we regard man's will as co-ordinate with grace. We must not regard salvation as man's work, in which God aids him, but as God's work, in which He concedes a certain share to us. Our sanctification is rather the will of God than our will. When Joshua² asked the Stranger by Jericho, 'Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?' he thought he had put the only possible alternatives. But the answer reproved him: 'Nay; but as Captain of the host of the Lord am I now come.' He was not come as helper of the Israelites against their foe; but, as Captain of God's host in its universal battle with evil, he would permit a share in a single engagement to Joshua and his people. That God's part in our sanctification should extend far beyond our co-operation, far beyond our understanding, is only to be expected. Our salvation is but an incident in the much wider war of God against the evil one.

It is just as likely, in consideration of the mysterious nature of grace, that much of its operation should be outside our consciousness. While the husbandman 'sleeps and rises night and day' the seed 'springs and grows up, he knoweth not how.'³ And we are led to think that many persons, reviewing their lives, thank God for grace of which, at the time when it was given, they were quite unconscious; they become aware of what may be called a cumulative effect of sacraments, ill-received at the time and not turned to effect, yet laying up a secret store of grace, which in due time overflowed its store-chamber.

In this connexion it may be well to remember how frequently enlightenment as to the real character of a sin is

¹ See *Dial.* iii. 8.

² Josh. v. 13.

³ St. Mark iv. 27.

only
with
great
dead

T
for us
sions
and l
have
the p
confe
sins.
sins.
siona
victio
circum
may
as an
which
them
ciate
point
a gen
the p

T
may,
to a p
fulness
tion r
by sin
of act
volitic
habit,
some
determ
autom
minec
St. Ca
mitted
search
her co
to the

But
but a

only gained after the sin has been overcome. We gave it up with little or no perception of its badness, and only knew the greatness of our deliverance when we looked back upon the dead bodies on the shore of the sea which we had passed.

The detailed remembrance of our sins is indeed necessary for us at one stage, for two reasons: because vague impressions can only create a weak conviction of our sinfulness, and because clear recollections of the past tell us what we have to confess and amend and resist in future. Therefore the promise of forgiveness is made¹ not to him who confesses that he is a sinner, but to him who confesses his sins. Yet more is needed than the detailed remembrance of sins. It is possible (as any priest may learn in the confessional) for the knowledge of details rather to obscure the conviction of sinfulness; for a person who can recall the precise circumstances and number of his falls into this or that sin may yet be far from contrition, because he regards each fall as an isolated event, not detecting the 'root of bitterness' which springs up in each such act, the 'law of sin' which binds them into a terrible unity. We do not for a moment depreciate the detailed knowledge and confession of sins when we point out that special instances should be used as indices of a general law of sinfulness, of which, without the memory of the particular instances, we should have remained unconscious.

The unconsciousness, then, of particular instances of sin may, in such a case as St. Catherine's, be almost equivalent to a perfect consciousness of an almost universal state of sinfulness or distance from God. An illustration of this observation may be borrowed from the will. Some acts we perform by simple automatism or by mere instinct. A higher series of acts are those which we perform by a distinct exercise of volition. But, again, repeated volition tends to produce a habit, by which we perform almost unconsciously acts which, some years ago, required energetic and perhaps painful self-determination. Yet what thoughtful person will confuse the automatism which lies beneath volition with the self-determined habit which is volition's crown? The Pharisee and St. Catherine are alike unconscious of the sin which they committed ten years ago: the Pharisee, because he has never searched his conscience; the saint, because the searching of her conscience has led her beyond that particular act of sin to the law of sin of which it was an expression.

But God, who hates sin, sees our sins not as isolated events, but as effects of a 'law of sin' which He will destroy, but

¹ 1 St. John i. 9.

of which we are at most only partially conscious ; so that we shall find our consciousness and co-operation not indeed excluded from the work of our salvation, but not covering the whole ground of it. His battle against sin brings pain to us, and necessarily of this pain the immediate cause will often be unknown to us.

Pain is the consequence which properly belongs to the violation of His laws. He lets us suffer that we may be roused to the horror of the sin into which we gaily walked ; so that we learn to hate sin first by the penalty of a temporal loss, or the stings of a wounded conscience, or the anticipation of a dreadful future. Pain in this respect is profitable just in proportion as it revives the memory of sin, and awakes the consciousness of present evil which needs to be burned out. But there is what may be called a secondary connexion between sin and suffering. Sin has placed us, more or less beyond our consciousness, in a wrong position with regard to God. The error which bound the body to earth, which made the soul the slave of the body and a rebel against the spirit, which made the spirit dream of satisfaction elsewhere than in God, has to be corrected ; and the whole blessed process of correction is death and pain. There is the pain of the healing of a wound as well as the pain of its infliction and its continuance. This pain of healing need not necessarily be closely associated with recollection of sins, because it is not the appointed remedy of sin, but rather the concomitant of its cure.

And this is, we believe, the experience of penitents. A man has sinned : his conscience is grieved, he is stung into humbling himself by confession, he learns from pain to watch against relapse : for this purpose a clear recollection of his evil act is necessary. But even if in process of time the particular sin is forgotten, he still suffers from a lasting sense of alienation from God, which kindles a more burning spirit of what St. Paul calls 'revenge.' Who is there who, after many years, could repeat the details of his first confession ? Yet that first confession has perhaps first lighted a fire of hatred of sin which ever grows in fervour.

It seems to us that this secondary aspect of pain may be of help in those cases, so trying to the faith of many, when terrible suffering comes on those who seem least to deserve it, and least able to learn from it. For the debauchee to suffer from broken health, for the murderer to die at the hand of the law, for the idler to come to want, even though the sinner be now in each case penitent, is evidently just ; he owns it to

be just
sin. B
disease
the ind
perplex
capable
hopeles
distress
insane
cannot
learnin
contem
to teach
graciou
of death
though
incapab
May no
a lesse
redeem

Ag
past sin
happin
forgive
my sin
Christ
shame
of my

It
inquit
for Hi
promis
away—
when v
tasmag
things
inquit

Th
among
perfect
strang

be just, and learns through his penalty a deeper hatred of his sin. But the temperate man likewise may die of a fearful disease, the innocent may share the scaffold with the criminal, the industrious man may be ruined by misfortune. Or, more perplexing still, the little child, regenerate and as yet incapable of actual sin, may spend its few days on the rack of hopeless disease; or the old man may drag out a life of distress, no longer able to gain strength by endurance; or the insane person may live under imaginary terrors which he cannot control, and from which he is not even capable of learning the lesson of patience. Is it not a comfort, when we contemplate such cases, to suppose that the pain is not intended to teach these persons a lesson, but is a concomitant of the gracious work of God bringing such souls through birth-pangs of death to the true life? And may we not stretch the same thought to cover the abundant sufferings of the lower creatures, incapable of sin and incapable of learning through pain? May not all pain be ultimately something much deeper than a lesson—even the Blood of the Cross by which God is redeeming to Himself a fallen world?

Again, St. Catherine's suggestion about forgetfulness of past sins may help us to conceive, however dimly, the future happiness of the saints. Many have said, 'God does, I trust, forgive me; but I can never forgive myself. I cannot forget my sins, that I have led others astray, that I have crucified Christ afresh; and I fear to be reminded for ever of my shameful past not by my own scars only, but by the wounds of my companions, and by the marks of the Lord Jesus.'

It is promised that God will remember our sins and iniquities no more. Whatever is, He cannot fail to know: for Him to forget implies that the sins have ceased to be. He promises not the ignoring but the remission—the sending away—of sins. May we not hope that to us also, His children, when we are completely at one with Him, the hideous phantasmagoria of sin may pass into nothing, so that we shall see things as He sees them, who is of too pure eyes to behold iniquity?

The strange lives of certain saints, and of Catherine among them, encourage us to endure in the hope that the perfect vision of God will be, and will make all things, stranger still.

ART. VIII.—THE POETRY OF GEORGE MEREDITH.

1. *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth.* By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1883.)
2. *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life.* By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1887.)
3. *A Reading of Earth.* By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1888.)
4. *Poems. The Empty Purse, with Odes to the Comic Spirit, To Youth in Memory and Verses.* By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1892.)
5. *Modern Love: a Reprint.* By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1892.)

WHAT distinguishes Mr. Meredith—of whose works a new and complete edition is now appearing—what distinguishes Mr. Meredith among living writers is not so much his possession of this or that quality, the intensity and variety of his sympathies, the power or peculiarity of his style: it is that in an era of talent, in an era in which we may be said to suffer from a plethora of talent, his work is so unmistakably beyond the reach of talent, so far, too, beyond the reach of labour added to ambition and desire—it is so unmistakably the work of genius. Readers of Mr. Meredith's novels long ago discovered in him the man with the key to a new garden of romance which matched the best loved of old, to a new gallery in art whose portraits might hang unabashed beside those of the old masters. From a little clan the readers of his prose have grown into an army; but for the readers of his verse, these may even now easily be numbered. Yet it is not beyond possibility—though the Meredith of to-day is indisputably the novelist—that the Meredith of the twentieth century may be the poet. 'All novels in every language,' said De Quincey, 'are hurrying to decay'—a judgment not without a germ of truth. Posterity, at all events, if one may venture to predict the future from the present—posterity will possess a considerable body of literature of its own, and will be necessarily impatient, as the present generation is impatient, of surplusage and bulk in the literature of the past; will do honour to the works of justest proportions, and harbour prejudices in favour of beauties apparent at first sight, and of excellence displayed in narrow ground. And in some sense poetry is excellence displayed in narrow ground, and may be

regarded
prose, t
packed
of Time

It c
century
of poet
that of
siderabl
uniform
his pros
without
critical
able and
relation
prets h
the less
his own
own pe
through
situation
utteranc
suppres
artist, w
self-rev
clear-ey
is for th
creation
a persis
the aut
it not v
speak
sympat
the pop
'with t
not, it i
mask o
essenti
out; a
philoso
contact
life; th
is hims
with th
this ver

regarded as prose cleared of the superfluous, transfigured prose, the sublimated essence, its precious sentiment close packed and embalmed for a long journey down the stream of Time.

It cannot be said of Mr. Meredith that no writer of his century has challenged the like serious attention in the field of poetry as well as of fiction. To leave a great name—that of Scott—out of account, there are other and not inconsiderable rivals. But Mr. Meredith has achieved a strikingly uniform success, such a success as makes it difficult to place his prose above his poetry, or his poetry above his prose, without misgivings that the verdict may be reversed by the critical court of the later generations. One thing is indisputable and noteworthy: Mr. Meredith's verse bears a very close relationship to his prose—it supplements, reinforces, and interprets his prose. Essentially a dramatic artist, he has none the less experienced the lyrical passion for the deliverance of his own soul, and in his verse has set free his thought in his own person. It is precisely the dramatic artist entering through his imaginative sympathy into the characters and situations of his *dramatis personæ* who presents 'the imaginary utterances of so many imaginary persons, not his,' and suppresses himself the while; it is precisely the dramatic artist, we may naturally suppose, in whom the impulse towards self-revelation exists most strongly. He is the wide and clear-eyed spectator of life who sees and pictures it best, but is for the most part content to remain unknown behind his creations. And in Mr. Meredith's fiction, as in Shakespeare's, a persistent and impenetrable irony veils the artist himself; the author lurks undiscovered behind the humourist. So was it not with Thackeray, who steps forward ever and anon to speak *in propria persona*. So was it not with Scott, whose sympathies there is no mistaking. Shakespeare in his sonnets, the popular theory has it, laid aside the mask of humour, and 'with the sonnet-key unlocked his heart.' Let this be so or not, it is certain that Mr. Meredith lays aside in his verse the mask of humour worn in his novels. His poetry is more essentially serious than his prose; it is grave almost throughout; a personal utterance, the expression of the individual philosophy of the man. The reader of the novels is in contact with the dramatic artist, the spectator and student of life; the poems are the outspoken utterance of the man who is himself one of the *dramatis personæ* in personal relation with the facts of the world. Taken together, this prose and this verse constitute an autobiography—the outlook and the

inlook of life. To Mr. Meredith's poetry belongs therefore a special, because a near and personal, interest; it supplements his prose, as has been said, and stands to it somewhat in the relation of interpretative criticism. Not the ignoble curiosity which pries into the private life of an author, but a legitimate intellectual curiosity is here satisfied. One is grateful to possess the individual view of so ardent and so brilliant a student of life, especially if, as in Mr. Meredith's case, no discord is introduced into the harmony of the entire impression received from his work. The predominant note in Mr. Meredith's work as a whole, both prose and verse, is its invincible fortitude, its cheerful acceptance of things as they are. He belongs to that company of artists who have looked the world in the face, and expressed neither disappointment nor dissatisfaction therewith. In an epoch in which poets are neither few nor insignificant, Mr. Meredith shares with Browning the distinction that he has never for the briefest season dwelt in the melancholy shade. Here is poetry in which prevails no sense of sadness, no overpowering sentiment of pity for the vexed human race, no Virgilian cry with its sense of tears in mortal things, no wistful regrets, no torturing doubts. Even so interesting and so great a writer as Count Tolstoi suffers at times a sense of hopelessness to overcome him, and involves us in his own despair. But Mr. Meredith's citadel of mind and heart is impregnable, and, while he will have us see the naked truth, fortifies us for its reception. In this poetry there is ever scant sympathy dispensed for weak nerves and apprehensive hearts. Read *Earth and Man*, or this *Whisper of Sympathy*:

'Hawk or shrike has done this deed
Of downy feathers; rueful sight!
Sweet sentimentalist, invite
Your bosom's Power to intercede.

So hard it seems that one must bleed
Because another needs will bite!
All round we see cold nature slight
The feelings of the totter-knee'd.

O it were pleasant, with you
To fly from this tussle of foes,
The shambles, the charnel, the wrinkle!
To dwell in yon dribble of dew
On the cheek of your sovereign rose,
And live the young life of a twinkle.'¹

¹ *Ballads and Poems*, p. 63.

'Par
absence
the devil
depravit
us by his
limitless
doubt, c
fashion.'

How lu
sions of
ennui,
fashion
his con
plicity,
in God,
this tho
unfavour
whose
greynes
is not
expecta
crop of
of the r
widenin
triumph
has bee
day tha
watch-
the bre
that wa
perfect
visions
them.
light th
But we
and th
the pro
They a
given
away v
latter-c
the atr
disillus
and d
autumn

'Part of the test of a great literatus,' said Whitman, 'shall be the absence in him of the idea of the covert, the lurid, the maleficent, the devil, the grim estimates inherited from the Puritans, hell, natural depravity, and the like. The great literatus will be known among us by his cheerful simplicity, his adherence to natural standards, his limitless faith in God, his reverence, and by the absence in him of doubt, ennui, burlesque, persiflage, or any strained or temporary fashion.'

How luminous a saying—but how shattering to the pretensions of the majority of our *literati*! The *absence* of doubt, ennui, burlesque, persiflage, or any strained or temporary fashion! Yet it is thus Mr. Meredith may be known among his contemporaries as the great literatus; by his cheerful simplicity, his adherence to natural standards, his limitless faith in God, and by the absence in him of doubt and ennui. And this though we have passed and are passing through times unfavourable to literature possessed of these qualities, times whose spiritual winds are chill, and whose skies grey with the greyness of the sea in winter. Too surely the modern world is not all that it was expected to be; it has disappointed expectation, and we moderns have reaped from it a plentiful crop of discouragement. Since the Renaissance, that birthday of the modern world, brought with it a sense of buoyancy, of widening horizons, and incalculable advances, and endless triumphs for humanity, since then only a poet here and there has been a minister of hope and promised great things in a day that was not very far off. These eager spirits on the watch-towers of thought saw at times, or thought they saw, the breaking light of some great morning of the world—a light that was about to fill the heavens and orb into humanity's perfect day. Wordsworth and Coleridge had these purple visions in youth, but the disillusioning years dealt hardly with them. Shelley could not bring himself to believe that the light that filled his own soul did not shine in the open sky. But we of the modern world do not suffer from these illusions, and the happy enthusiasts among us who put their trust in the progress of science seem also to suffer from disillusion. They are reluctantly brought to confess that while science has given liberally to humanity with one hand, she has taken away with the other. While, however, the majority of the latter-day poets have felt the absence of inspiring motives in the atmosphere of the time, Mr. Meredith breathes the keen disillusioning air without pain and without discouragement, and declares it to be spiritually bracing. The season is autumn, and the grey mist

' Narrows the world to my neighbour's gate,
Paints me life as a wheezy crone. . . .
I, even I, for a zenith of sun
Cry, to fulfil me, nourish my blood ;
O for a day of the long light, one !'

But here is the last word :

' Verily now is our season of seed,
Now, in our Autumn ; and Earth discerns
Them that have served her in them that can read,
Glassing, where under the surface she burns,
Quick at her wheel, while the fuel, decay,
Brightens the fire of renewal ; and we ?
Death is the word of a bovine to-day,
Know you the breast of the springing To-be ?' ¹

The majority of the poets seek refuge when the psychological climate of the times is unfavourable to poetry, the majority seek refuge in the limitless romance of the past. Not so Mr. Meredith. He is a poet of a *sæculum realisticum*, and the only romance for him is the real romance of the present, the inexhaustible romance of the future. The poetry with the passion for the past, the poetry that would hang its richly wrought arabesque in gold and purple between us and the facts of life, has here given place to the poetry with an undivided allegiance to the present, and to truth palatable or unpalatable. Goldsmith, that tender, human-hearted poet, wrote of his favourite books as being those which, amusing the imagination, contributed to ease the heart, and in another of his exquisite sentences defined the office of the poet-sage—'Innocently to amuse the imagination in this dream of life is wisdom.' The wisdom of Mr. Meredith's poetry is made of sterner stuff. If we are to be cradled in comfortable philosophies, transcendental or mystical, lapped in soft Lydian airs, or borne in a car of song by the instinct of sweet music driven, we must read poetry other than this. And Mr. Meredith declines, too, the sad task in which Matthew Arnold engaged, the task of 'sweeping up the dead leaves fallen from the dying tree of faith.'

' These are our sensual dreams ;
Of the yearning to touch, to feel
The dark Impalpable sure
And have the Unveiled appear.' ²

Poetry such as this, devoid of the sentiment of regret, devoid of that tender melancholy so characteristic of Matthew

¹ *A Reading of Earth*, pp. 2-4.

² *Ibid.* p. 89.

Arnold
which
of the
appeal
The ch
chords
exclusi
string.
us the
joy of

But po
Protea
but th
astonis
vitality
a flavo
to real
its fres
reality
triumph
' I
that th
people
sensati
gible ;
and g
This is
and, if
prefer

Arnold ; almost devoid, too, of the sentiment of pathos ; poetry which seems to shun the elegiac sentiment in which so much of the world's poetry is steeped, and by which it makes its appeal ; poetry like this strikes a strange and original note. The chords to which Mr. Meredith trusts for his effects are chords seldom heard upon the lyre ; his is a poetry of almost exclusively intellectual interest—the music from an iron string. It is not to be expected that this poetry should give us the full sense of vitality as Chaucer gives it, of the mere joy of living, or charm us to dreamful ease as Spenser charms.

‘ He who has looked upon Earth
Deeper than flower and fruit
Loses some hue of his mirth.’¹

But poesy has an infancy, an adolescence, an immortality Protean. Mr. Meredith's is not the buoyant spirit of Chaucer, but the virtue of his poetry resides none the less in its astonishing vitality and in the power to communicate that vitality. To the freshness and buoyancy it possesses is added a flavour of intellectual bitter that springs from its devotion to reality, and it is by reason of its rarely mingled elements, its freshness and buoyancy, and its strenuous devotion to reality that Mr. Meredith's poetry achieves a new poetic triumph.

‘ I am certain,’ said Keats of his own *Lamia*, ‘ I am certain that there is that sort of fire in it which must take hold of people in some way—give them either pleasant or unpleasant sensation.’ The poetry of Mr. Meredith, too, is not negligible ; it has that sort of fire in it which takes hold of one, and gives him either a pleasant or unpleasant sensation. This is verse that will not suffer a reader to pass by in peace, and, if it makes not music for him, he will, with Hotspur, prefer to hear the dry wheel grate on the axle-tree.

‘ Square along the couch, and stark,
Like the sea-rejected thing
Sea-sucked white, behold their king
Attila, my Attila ! . . .
Him, their lord of day and night,
White, and lifting up his blood
Dumb for vengeance. Name us that,
Huddled in the corner dark,
Humped and grinning like a cat,
Teeth for lips ! ’Tis she ! She stares
Glittering through her bristled hairs.
Rend her ! Pierce her to the hilt ! ’²

¹ *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth*, p. 30.

² *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*, p. 93.

Discriminating readers of Mr. Meredith's novels have no doubt felt the presence of the poet even in his garment of prose, but probably few suspect that the poet preceded the novelist. His first public appearance was with a volume, published in 1851, simply entitled *Poems*, and dedicated to his father-in-law, Thomas Love Peacock. It was not until some years later that he took the field with a novel, *The Shaving of Shagpat*. The second volume of *Poems* appeared in 1862 (three years after *Richard Feverel*), *Modern Love and Poems of the English Roadside, with Poems and Ballads*; the third, *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth*, in 1883; the fourth, *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*, in 1887; the fifth, *A Reading of Earth*, in 1888; the sixth, *The Empty Purse and other Poems*, in 1892. Of these the first volume is now a rare treasure, more especially as the author has not cared to reprint his *Juvenilia*, and the second contains, besides many verses never reprinted, the original *Modern Love*, which was selected by the author for republication as a separate volume in 1892, accompanied by some new poems.

The best order in which first to read Mr. Meredith's poetry is not, I think, the chronological order. If one begins with *A Reading of Earth*, and passes to the remaining volumes by way of the *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth*, one moves more easily, receives a more continuous, a more unbroken impression, and enters at once into sympathy with the attitude of the author. And Mr. Meredith's attitude, his choice of subject, and his method require to be acquiesced in—'not to sympathise is not to understand.' A poet commonly places himself *en rapport* with his audience by his choice of subject or by the adoption of a familiar method, and he is accustomed as artist to retire to a distance from his work and to contemplate its effect from a point of view not entirely his own. He has during the creative process his audience in his eye. If he is unable or unwilling to gain this remoteness from his own creation, if he declines to place himself either by choice of subject or by the adoption of a familiar method at the universal point of view, he demands an unusual intellectual activity from his readers, and wins his way with them certainly more gradually, perhaps not at all. Approval of his choice of subject, approval of his method, are not assured him until it be granted that the effect has justified the means. For a law of parsimony holds in art: the old methods are sealed by acceptance, and a new, if not successful, is an impertinence.

The *onus probandi* rests with such a poet to show good

reason
progre
progre
subjec
overco
voice t
of ind
promis
the fre
new m
that w
into th
With '
to his
by a n
should
is achi
force, i
though
he has
times
arises
obscur
to say
and de
that in
unfam
vagues
intoler
in the
obscur
travel
of sple

then t
underg
such a

VOL

reason for his departure from accredited poetic example. The progress of Wordsworth through ridicule to fame was the progress of a poet of determined independence in choice of subject as well as in poetic methods. Yet opposition once overcome, it is the poet with the note of strangeness in his voice to whom we return—the note of strangeness is the note of individuality. In poetry, too, as in all art, there is a compromise effected, and the note of strangeness is the mark of the fresh compromise, the alteration of balance effected by the new method, the new choice of subject. Or rather let us say that with each original poet a novel aspect of things is brought into the foreground, a new predominant purpose is displayed. With Tennyson the main purpose was to bend his language to his thought so that no verse should escape him unenriched by a musical cadence, that no arrow unfeathered with melody should leave his bow. With Mr. Meredith the main purpose is achieved if no line, no phrase escape him uninformed by force, if he discharge no shaft unwinged or unweighted with thought. Hence obscurity is the charge brought against him; he has been called an inarticulate poet, and indisputably he is at times obscure. But like Browning's, Mr. Meredith's obscurity arises out of the number and fervency of his ideas; he is obscure because he has so much to say and is in such haste to say it, and moreover insists upon his own point of view and demands from his reader that flexibility of intelligence, that intellectual activity necessary to the appreciation of an unfamiliar poetic method. And obscurity is after all the vaguest of charges. Gray was accounted obscure; Shelley intolerably obscure; Tennyson, even our popular Tennyson, in the days of his early triumphs was censured for his obscurity. And if the readers of Browning are content to travel far, and at times even with lagging step, to catch sight of splendours such as this—

‘I shall keep your honour safe;
With mine I trust you, as the sculptor trusts
Yon marble woman with the marble rose,
Loose on her hand, she never will let fall,
In graceful, slight, silent security,’

then the readers of Mr. Meredith may well be content to undergo occasional mental fatigue for the sake of, let us say, such a magnificent *Meditation under Stars* as this—

‘We who reflect those rays, though low our place
To them are lastingly allied.
So may we read, and little find them cold;
Not frosty lamps illumining dead space,

Not distant aliens, not senseless powers.
 The fire is in them whereof we are born ;
 The music of their motion may be ours.
 Spirit shall deem them beckoning Earth and voiced
 Sisterly to her, in her beams rejoiced.
 Of love, the grand impulsion we behold
 The love that lends her grace
 Among the starry fold.
 Then at new flood of customary morn,
 Look at her through her showers,
 Her mists, her streaming gold.
 A wonder edges the familiar face :
 She wears no more that robe of printed hours ;
 Half strange seems Earth, and sweeter than her flowers.¹

It may freely be granted that in general we have too continuous a strain, too unrelieved an emphasis in Mr. Meredith's poetry. It lacks breathing spaces, points of repose for the imagination. Once we have ascended his poetic car we are borne along at full speed, a speed that is rarely slackened until the goal be reached. Thus it comes that one cannot read for long in these volumes, as in Tennyson's ; one cannot fleet the time carelessly with this poet as with Mr. William Morris. Mr. Meredith is not of the singers who simply say the most heart-easing things, who lead us to their favourite haunts by wood or stream and discourse music to us that we may drink oblivion of care and pass into a many-coloured dream of flitting shadows. And if he fall short as a poet, it is that his poetry is too strenuous to be altogether peaceful, and that the impressions received from it are too crowded to permit of that leisurely sipping of the cup, that tranquil enjoyment which is essential to the due appreciation of poetry. Poetry and haste are eternal incompatibles. One cannot bolt a stanza in the five minutes' interval between engagements, nor can one find perfect happiness in the company of a poet whose pace is always a gallop. Mr. Meredith's verse has caught contagion from the hurry and the bustle of modern life. And his utterance, too, is a *staccato* utterance. It would be untrue to say of him that there was no light and shade in his conceptions, but there is often an absence of light and shade in his expression. And though Mr. Meredith conceives aright the sensuous as well as the intellectual life, his poetry usually, though with brilliant instances to the contrary, lacks the sensuous element, usually fails to express that element as vividly as it expresses the intellectual. Lan-

¹ *A Reading of Earth*, p. 12.

guage, es
 than tha
 make ap
 memory
 Yet this
 in which
 rather w
 gratitude.
 critics ass
 Mr. Henl
 the very
 beauty to
 Take this

But we sh
 always th
 of a man
 strable. T
 English po
 sweetness,
 with the c
 The meas
 Meredith g
 dances to t

'Cool was
 Keeping
 Cricketing
 O the d

'Could I fi
 I would
 Every woo
 Flashing
 Flushing li
 Streamin
 Flashing a
 All seem

guage, especially the language of poetry, has an office other than that of mirroring with precision a train of ideas; it must make appeal to the senses, to the eye and to the ear, to the memory and its associations, to the imagination and its dreams. Yet this is not the day nor the hour to complain of poetry in which the intellectual element outbalances the sensuous; rather we owe to poetry of which this is true a debt of gratitude. A little thought goes far in modern verse, and the critics assure us that even that little is unnecessary. 'Poetry,' Mr. Henley tells us, 'is style.' And in Mr. Meredith's poetry the very force and intensity of his thought communicate a beauty to his phrase—the beauty that shines in strength. Take this of Byron's *Manfred*—

'Considerably was the world
Of spinsterdom and clergy racked
When he his hinted horrors hurled,
And she pictorially attacked.
A duel hugeous! Tragic? Ho!
The cities, not the mountains blow
Such bladders; in their shapes confessed
An after dinner's indigest.'¹

But we should wrong Mr. Meredith by saying that his is always the music from an iron string. That he is master of a manner besides this of rugged force is easily demonstrable. The critic will need to search diligently through English poetry to discover a poem of more blithe and gracious sweetness, more radiant with the dew and sunshine of morning, with the captivating joyance of youth than *Love in a Valley*. The measure—and it may be noted that in metres Mr. Meredith greatly and successfully dares—the measure itself dances to the tripping pulses of the young blood.

'Cool was the woodside; cool as her white dairy
Keeping sweet the cream-pan; and there the boys from school,
Cricketing below, rushed red and brown with sunshine;
O the dark translucence of the deep-eyed cool!'

'Could I find a place to be alone with heaven,
I would speak my heart out: heaven is my need.
Every woodland tree is flushing like the dog-wood,
Flushing like the white beam, swaying like the reed.
Flushing like the dog-wood crimson in October;
Streaming like the flag-reed south-west blown;
Flashing as in gusts the sudden-lighted white beam;
All seem to know what is for heaven alone.'²

¹ *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*, p. 68.

² *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth*, p. 95.

Here, and in a pastoral not reprinted from his earliest volume, Mr. Meredith's verse bubbles, and creams and ripples from the very founts of spring and summer.

'Come, and like bees will we gather the rich golden honey of noon-tide

Deep in the sweet summer meadows, bordered by hill-side and river. . . .

O joy thus to revel all day in the grass of our own below'd country, Revel all day till the lark mounts at eve with his sweet "tirra-lirra;" Thrilling delightfully.'

The lyric beauty of poems such as these will recall to readers of the novels the passion-brimming lyrical enchantments woven in the 'Ferdinand and Miranda' chapters of *Richard Feverel*, beside which I do not know that there is anything in literature to be placed since *Romeo and Juliet* itself. In others of the *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth* is heard the same clear lark-like trill of gladness, a music as of the early world untouched by human pain or sorrow, a song of the elements—

'Water, first of singers, o'er rocky mount and mead,
First of earthly singers, the sun-loved rill
Sang of him, and flooded the ripples on the reed
Seeking whom to waken and what ear fill.'¹

But to enter into the true spirit of Mr. Meredith's poetry of nature, we must come to it by way of *A Reading of Earth*. We are constantly assured by modern criticism and by the practice of modern poets that it is no part of the poet's duty to be a teacher, that the exposition of belief lies altogether outside the province of art. Mr. Meredith abides by the tradition of the greater English poets, Spenser and Milton and Wordsworth, and his poetry frankly outlines a faith, delineates a philosophy of life. It is a creed of full and lasting 'joy in the old heart of things;' but how hold and live by that creed in the face of the certain sorrows, the uncertain issues, the unavoidable partings of life, the knowledge that

'The word of the world is adieu
Her word; and the torrents are round
The jawed wolf-waters of prey'²

To preserve for the human race during its dark hours the heart of hope, the faith that there is some soul of goodness in things evil, that evil itself is not immortal, and that the

¹ *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth*, p. 73.

² *A Reading of Earth*, p. 71.

destiny.
this hea
ment of
threaten
upon th
offer us
fuller lif
soul. H
tradition
The res
replies m
argues
them

In A
sets for
philosoph
informed
now, as
becom
because
unalter
of thing
world o
equal fi
upon th
Christia
Only w

has bee

has bee

destiny of man is something more than to die, to preserve this heart of hope and this faith is not the meanest achievement of the poet. Yet, when this faith and this hope are threatened, so exclusively does the poetic spirit seem to feed upon the beauty and the pathos of life that the poets often offer us no more than a sad philosophy of 'indifference,' or a fuller life of the senses, the worship of the flesh in despair of soul. But Mr. Meredith in this also abides by the poetic tradition of the greater poets and refuses to despair of soul. The resurgent brood of questions to which Earth, our mother, replies not are but the brood of unfaith, and earth's silence argues no indifference to her children. Of those who ask them

'Earth whispers they scarce have the thirst,
Except to unriddle a rune ;
And I spin none ; only show,
Would humanity soar from its worst,
Winged above darkness and dole,
How flesh unto spirit must grow.
Spirit raves not for a goal.

. . . it trusts

Uses my gifts yet aspires
Dreams of a higher than it.'¹

In *A Faith on Trial* and in *Earth and Man* Mr. Meredith sets forth a spiritual philosophy of courageous faith, a philosophy akin in some respects to that of Wordsworth, but informed by the later spirit of scientific realism. The poet is now, as the man of the future will be, as we are all fast becoming, neither idealist nor realist, neither one nor the other because both. If Mr. Meredith in his poetry rejects with the unalterable mien of physical science any mystical explanation of things which leaves the facts and laws of the great external world of our physical nature out of account, he rejects with equal firmness the philosophy of immediate conclusions based upon the slight and meagre knowledge we possess. Like the Christian's, Mr. Meredith's word is 'Faith till proof be ready.' Only when the lesson of

'A fortitude quiet as Earth's
At the shedding of leaves'²

has been duly learned, only when the attitude of

'unfaith clamouring to be coined
To faith by proof'

has been abandoned, can the inheritance of the children of

¹ *A Reading of Earth*, p. 99.

² *Ibid.* p. 67.

Earth be entered upon, the children whose love is without fear, who have taken to heart Earth's counsel,

' "And if thou hast good faith, it can repose,"
She tells her son.'¹

The poem which stands first in the volume of *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth* conveys a warning on the threshold to those about to enter on the inheritance, the harvest of full delight in companionship with Earth. These are enchanted woods, and the only charm that affords protection is a spirit of courageous confidence.

'Enter these enchanted woods,
You who dare,
Nothing harms beneath the leaves
More than waves a swimmer cleaves.
Toss your head up with the lark,
Foot at peace with mouse and worm,
Fair you fare.
Only at a dread of dark
Quaver, and they quit their form,
Thousand eyeballs under hoods
Have you by the hair.
Enter these enchanted woods,
You who dare.'²

Few among Mr. Meredith's poems are more quaintly, and at the same time more powerfully, conceived than this, *The Woods of Westermain*. The very spirit of the forest is abroad in it, a mystery of life lurks in the thicket and among the leaves. With it should be read *Melampus*—

'Where others hear but a hum and see but a beam,
The tongue and eye of the fountain of life he knew.'³

Here, as in all his nature-poems, Mr. Meredith moves with the firm step of one to whom the path is a familiar one: a subtle accuracy of observation shines in every epithet. There is no poet since the death of Wordsworth for whom nature has meant so much as for Mr. Meredith. From many of his poems one might conceive him as entirely preoccupied with nature, a close and eager student, to whom the world of individual men and women was little more than a shadowland. How far this is wide of the truth readers of Mr. Meredith's novels are indeed aware; and perhaps we need go no further for convincing proof, if any were needed, of the mental grasp and breadth displayed in his work, a breadth and grasp un-

¹ *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth*, p. 128.

² *Ibid.* p. 1.

³ *Ibid.* p. 83.

mate
by nat
must
knowl
displa
nature
passio
of spi
by sci
indivi
poets
the fir
moder
view v
memb
courag
fears,
the w
provin
hopes
Mr.
the na
would
serve

and to
with s

She is
of her
master
hugest
misrea
issues

Mr.
he is a
grasp,
A

matched in the work of any living man. The place occupied by nature in modern poetry since the advent of Wordsworth must in large measure be associated with the growth of a knowledge of nature, and the desire for that knowledge displayed in scientific investigation. With Mr. Meredith nature is not so much, as with Wordsworth, an object of impassioned contemplation, an enclaspings presence, the source of spiritual ecstasy. She is rather nature as revealed to us by science, the eternal activity, the nature that overflows with individual life. And an enduring place among the English poets is assured to Mr. Meredith if for this alone, that he is the first to accept fearlessly the view of nature offered by modern science, and not to accept it only, but to find that view vitally poetic and inspiring. For this he will be remembered. He will be remembered and honoured as that courageous spirit who, when his companions were assailed by fears, embraced with ready welcome the entire unbroken ring, the whole result of science, and, claiming this too as a province of art, drew from the new truths fresh auguries and hopes and lessons for humanity.

Mr. Meredith's study of nature is that of the naturalist, the naturalist who has become the passionate lover. He would have us believe that a closer intimacy with nature will serve to prove her

‘Mother of simple truth,
Relentless quencher of lies,
Eternal in thought,’

and to dispel the unworthy apprehensions which, judging her with shrinking nerves, make her ‘a cruel sphinx,’

‘A mother of aches and jests ;
Soulless, heading a hunt,
Aimless except for the meal.’¹

She is before and above all the Earth our mother, instructress of her children ; and to prate of other worlds ere we have mastered this and its lessons seems to Mr. Meredith the hugest of follies. Through the knowledge of earth, ‘never misread by brain,’ we approach a fuller consciousness of the issues and meanings of life,

‘Till brain-rule splendidly towers.’²

Mr. Meredith is at times obscure, but he is never intangible ; he is at times difficult, but he is never unreal. Sureness of grasp, concentration, force, significance—these are the splendid

¹ *A Reading of Earth*, p. 78.

² *The Empty Purse*, p. 28.

qualities of his style, and at times one catches an accent, a phrase, a verse exquisitely tuneful, a melody wholly his own. How much of the poetry of talent, how much even of the poetry of genius, fails because it does not go deep enough, because it does not lay hold of reality! Mr. Meredith's poetry of nature lays firm hold of reality. Just as Browning had no fear of the real, but delighted in the uncouth, the forbidding, the extravagant natural forms—

‘See our fisher arrive
And pitch down his basket before us ; all trembling alive
With pink and grey jellies, your sea-fruit ; you touch the strange
 lumps,
And mouths gape there, eyes open, all manner of horns and of
 humps’—

so Mr. Meredith does not fear the real, and does not reserve himself to celebrate nature in

‘Her pomp of glorious hues,
Her revelries of ripeness, her kind smile.’¹

His ‘cosmic enthusiasm’ is without reservations, his spiritual freedom untrammelled and entire.

The Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life display Mr. Meredith in his characteristic, his unmistakable style, the style which is the despair of so many readers. Here are ballads, indeed, but not of that species which may be defined as the simplest and most direct form of narrative poetry. To disentangle these tales one must proceed warily, and piece each together, like a mosaic, from hints, reflections, apostrophes, and the future may not find ballads of this order acceptable. Save in *The Nuptials of Attila*, the vigour of the manner hardly compensates for the harshness of the narration. But *The Nuptials of Attila* is a notable exception, a notable poem. It is not only a notable, it is an altogether marvellous and indescribable poem. To read it is to hear the tread of armies, to mingle in the tossing tumult of barbarian camps, to catch one's breath in the presence of the Queen of Tragedy herself. There is no poem with which it can to any purpose be compared. From first to last it displays the characteristics of Mr. Meredith at his best and strongest, and will take rank among the great achievements of modern verse as a *tour de force* of unique power and splendour.

The volume containing these ballads, which represent the poet in his most disdainful mood of the accepted poetical

¹ *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth*, p. 119.

meth
acad
art.
cemb
spee
mast

T
wort
Engl
it be
he in
in th
move
poeti
certa
art, s
sont
Mod
—me
ment
be ri
alrea
the S
and
expr
persu

methods, represents him also in his docile mood of almost academic 'correctness,' content to move in familiar ways of art. The sustained magnificence of diction in '*France*, December 1870,' recalls the historical accents of our English speech, the English language as written by its greatest masters, as we have grown to love and hope to preserve it.

'The Gods alone

Remember everlastingly ; they strike

Remorselessly, and ever like for like.

By their great memories the Gods are known.'

'Lo, strength is of the plain root-virtues born ;

Strength shall ye gain by service, prove in scorn,

Train by endurance, by devotion shape.

Strength is not won by miracle or rape.

It is the offspring of the modest years,

The gift of sire to son, thro' those firm laws

Which we name God's ; which are the righteous cause,

The cause of man, and manhood's ministers.'

'Soaring France,

Now is Humanity on trial in thee ;

Now may'st thou gather humankind in fee ;

Now prove that Reason is a quenchless scroll ;

Make of calamity thine aureole,

And bleeding, lead us thro' the troubles of the sea.'¹

This is the English of Milton, and Southey, and Wordsworth, the English that speaks the character and power of the English race. It is evidently not because Mr. Meredith finds it beyond his power to write a simple and direct style that he indulges in the style characteristic of him. In *France*, and in that remarkable series of poems entitled *Modern Love*, he moves with ease and dignity within the strictest traditions of poetic diction, and if the latter exhibits any obscurities, they are certainly not obscurities of expression. The works of ancient art, said Sainte-Beuve, 'ne sont pas classiques parce qu'ils sont vieux, mais parce qu'ils sont énergiques, frais et dispos.' *Modern Love* is a series of sonnets—we may call them sonnets—modern in phrase, modern in sentiment, modern in their treatment of a subject unknown to ancient art, yet if Sainte-Beuve be right, then is Mr. Meredith, the author of *Modern Love*, already a classic. On the appearance of this poem in 1862, the *Spectator* spoke of the author as dealing here with 'a deep and painful subject upon which he has no convictions to express.' But the aim of Mr. Meredith's art is neither to persuade nor to tranquillize. He is neither a concise doc-

¹ *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*, pp. 117, 119, 126.

trinaire with ready-made conclusions for his readers, nor the type of poet who affords agreeable shelter for the imagination from the strain and the stress of life. Throughout his poetry this strain and stress is exhibited; the fingers of the artist are upon the pulse of the modern world. The web and the woof of Mr. Meredith's poetry is its resolute devotion to the conditions that are present, his achievement as a poet is the singular exactness with which these conditions are presented by him, and elevated to poetic rank. He has extracted inspiration from conditions which seemed incapable of supplying inspiration, which seemed hostile to it, and from the dull or commonplace or dispiriting aspects of life has rescued the stimulus or interest which, properly approached and viewed by the artist, they offer. Sedatives are abundantly supplied in the poetry of our day and generation in the poetry for example of Mr. William Morris; in its tonic properties consists the virtue of Mr. Meredith's poetry. It kindles energy because energy is its preponderating quality, and if he has not cared to provide for his readers the graces and harmonics to which they have grown accustomed, compensations are not wanting. Let it be granted that the familiar accessories of colour and rhythm and impassioned feeling are subservient to the heart of thought. Thought is his familiar, and finds him in every mood; finds him intense and eager, finds him pensive or lyrical, or passionate or mirthful, finds him careful or careless of his art, but is his constant, his ever-present familiar, and the wise will be willing to accept Mr. Meredith in all his moods.

If the music seem harsh or the strain a jangled one,

'But listen in the thought; so may there come
Conception of a newly-added chord,
Commanding space beyond where ear has home.'¹

As to the greatness of *Modern Love* in respect of execution Mr. Swinburne may be left to speak.

'Take almost any sonnet at random out of this series, and let anyone qualified to judge for himself of metre, choice of expression, and splendid language decide on its claims. And, after all, the test will be unfair except as regards metrical or pictorial merit, every section of this great progressive poem being connected with the other by links of the finest and most studied workmanship. Take, for example, that noble sonnet, beginning

'We saw the swallows gathering in the skies,'

¹ *Modern Love*, p. 2.

a more perfect piece of writing no man alive has turned out ; witness these three lines, the greatest perhaps of the book :

‘ And in the largeness of the evening earth,
Our spirit grew as we walked side by side,
The hour became her husband and my bride ;’

but in transcription it must lose the colour and effect given it by its place in the series ; the grave and tender beauty, which make it at once a bridge and a resting-place between the admirable poems of passion it falls among.¹

It needs but to read this sonnet-sequence, or some other of the finer of Mr. Meredith’s sonnets—*Lucifer in Starlight* or *The Spirit of Shakspeare*—or to recall lines like these :

‘ In tragic life, God wot
No villain need be ! Passions spin the plot ;
We are betrayed by what is false within ;’¹

or these :

‘ The city of the smoky fray ;
A prodded ox, it drags and moans :
Its Morrow no man’s child ; its Day
A vulture’s morsel beaked to bones ;’²

it needs but to read such poetry to feel that it follows the best traditions of English verse, owing its effects, not to verbal ingenuities, but to simple gravity of thought expressed in words which follow a natural order, whose music is the wholly unforced music of the greater poets.

The poetry of Mr. Meredith gives a new aim to art, and demands a new feeling for the results attained in pursuance of that aim and the altered conditions essential to it. But the lovers of the poetry of an elder day will not find it impossible or even difficult to accommodate their vision to the changed surroundings. There is a sentence quoted by Professor Dowden in his essay from Edgar Quinet which seems to me to express with admirable strength and conciseness the impressions that will finally be left upon the reader of Mr. Meredith’s poetry : ‘ Each day justice has appeared to me more holy, liberty more fair, speech more sacred, art more real, reality more artistic, poetry more true, truth more poetical, nature more divine, and what is divine more natural.’

¹ *Modern Love*, p. 58.

² *A Reading of Earth*, p. 29.

ART. IX.—BRIGHTMAN'S EASTERN LITURGIES.

Liturgies Eastern and Western, being the Texts, original or translated, of the principal Liturgies of the Church. Edited, with Introduction and Appendices, by F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A. Vol. I. *Eastern Liturgies.* (Oxford, 1896.)

IN the year 1878 the Rev. C. E. Hammond edited for the Clarendon Press a collection of 'Ancient Liturgies,' under the title of *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. It was a most useful book; it brought the study of Liturgiology within the reach of ordinary students, and became the text-book of the limited number of persons who took in that special subject in the final honour theological school in our Universities. The best proof of its usefulness is afforded by the fact that the book is now out of print. The Delegates of the Clarendon Press, accordingly, determined to issue a second edition, and on Mr. Hammond declining to superintend its preparation, transferred the task to Mr. Brightman. Hence the present volume. But it has blossomed out into a much altered and far larger work than the book of Mr. Hammond—so much larger, indeed, that the new work is to consist of two volumes instead of one, and what we have before us is the first part only of Mr. Brightman's labours, and deals with Eastern Liturgies alone. Western Liturgies are to follow hereafter. We can only add that if they are treated in the same scholarly and thorough manner in which Eastern Liturgies have been treated in the volume before us, Part II. will be a great gain to theological, and especially to liturgical, literature.

The difference in bulk between Mr. Hammond's and Mr. Brightman's books will be best seen by exhibiting their contents, as to texts represented, in parallel columns. It must, of course, be remembered that Mr. Hammond's book included certain Western Liturgies as well.

HAMMOND.	SOURCE OF TEXT.	BRIGHTMAN.	SOURCE OF TEXT.
I. <i>Group I.—West Syrian Family.</i>		I. <i>The Syrian Rite.</i>	
The Clementine Liturgy.	Ueltzen's edit. 1853.	<i>Ditto.</i>	De Lagarde's edit. 1862.
Greek Liturgy of St. James.	Demetrius Ducas' edit. 1526.	<i>Ditto.</i>	Paris Bibl. Nat. MS. Græc. 2509 (xiv. cent.)

HAMMOND.	SOURCE OF TEXT.	BRIGHTMAN.	SOURCE OF TEXT.
I. <i>Group I.—West Syrian Family—continued.</i>		I. <i>The Syrian Rite—continued.</i>	
Syriac Liturgy of St. James.	Renaudot, <i>Litt. Orient. Coll.</i> 1847. Latin translation.	<i>Ditto.</i>	An English translation from nine different sources MS. and printed.
Liturgy of Constantinople with Anaphoræ of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom (ad normam hodie acceptam).	Daniel, <i>Codex Liturgicus</i> , 1847-53.	<i>See below.</i>	
Armenian Liturgy.	English translation of Rev. S. C. Malan, 1870.	<i>See below.</i>	
II. <i>Alexandrian Family.</i>			
Liturgy of St. Mark.	Renaudot, <i>Litt. Orient. Coll.</i> 1847.	<i>Ditto.</i>	A. Drouard, Paris, 1583, with additions and corrections.
Coptic Liturgy, with Anaphora of St. Cyril and St. Basil.	A Latin translation, Renaudot, <i>Litt. Orient. Coll.</i> 1847.	Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril.	An English translation from Bodl. MS. Huntingt. 360 (xiii. cent.), with additions.
The Anaphora of the Ethiopic Church Ordinances.	A Latin translation, Ludolphus's edit. 1691.	<i>Ditto.</i>	<i>Ditto</i> (in English).
Ethiopic Liturgy (of the Apostles).	A Latin translation, Renaudot, <i>Litt. Orient. Coll.</i> 1874.	<i>Ditto.</i>	Englished from Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 545 (xvii. cent.) with additions and corrections.
III. <i>East Syrian Family.</i>		III. <i>The Persian Rite.</i>	
Liturgy of SS. Adæus and Maris.	A Latin translation, Renaudot, <i>Litt. Orient. Coll.</i> 1847.	<i>Ditto.</i>	Englished from the <i>editio princeps</i> , printed at Urmi, 1890.

HAMMOND.	SOURCE OF TEXT.	BRIGHTMAN.	SOURCE OF TEXT.
		IV. <i>The Byzantine Rite.</i>	
<i>Wanting.</i>		Liturgy of Constantinople, with Anaphoræ of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom.	From the Barberini MS. c. 800., with additions.
<i>Wanting.</i>		Liturgy of the Presanctified.	From the Barberini MS. c. 800.
<i>See above.</i>		Liturgy of Constantinople, with Anaphoræ of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil (ad normam hodie acceptam).	<i>Euchologion</i> , Venice, 1869.
<i>See above.</i>		Armenian Liturgy.	Englished from an edition printed at Constantinople, 1873.

It will be seen that so far as bulk of text is concerned, Mr. Hammond's and Mr. Brightman's books stand on the same level, with the exception that Mr. Brightman gives us a late eighth or early ninth century as well as a nineteenth-century text of the Liturgy of Constantinople, and also the same late eighth or early ninth century text of the Constantinople Liturgy of the Presanctified, which was not represented at all in the earlier volume. These additions are taken from the earliest known extant MS. of the Rite, the famous Barberini MS. at Rome, which had, however, been previously printed by Goar,¹ Bunsen,² and Swainson.³

But, apart from bulk, in mode of treatment and in method of presentation of text, Mr. Brightman improves upon his predecessors in the following particulars of lesser or of greater importance.

1. Cues are expanded, and headings and titles are introduced, which very much clear up the order of the services, especially in the older MSS., where helps of this sort scantily occur. All such additions are within brackets, so that they can be distinguished easily and at once from the actual con-

¹ *Euchologion*, Paris, 1647, pp. 98-100.

² *Analecta Ante-Nicana*, London, 1854, iii. 201-36.

³ *The Greek Liturgies*, Cambridge, 1884, pp. 76-98.

tents
the serv

2. 1
Liturgi
eye can
volume
quotati

3. 2
use of
abando
faithful
uncials,
text; t
Dr. Sw
Brightn

4. 3
time.
text of
as repr
printed
Barberi
be a vic

that w
Swains
duced i
do not
importa
MS. tex
own sak

We h
at haph
may be
and as a
as comp

5. A
presenti
Coptic,
The ide
own lan
unintell
graduate
bridge c
by most
been to
translati

tents of any MS. text. Rubrics, explanatory of the course of the service are introduced in the same way.

2. Passages of Holy Scripture, of which these ancient Liturgies are full, are printed in small uncials, so that the eye can catch them at once, and there is at the end of the volume a very full and carefully constructed index of Biblical quotations and cross-references.

3. The modern mode of punctuation, and the modern use of capital letters, as introduced by Dr. Swainson, are abandoned, and the usage of the MS. in these respects is faithfully copied. Where capital letters, in the shape of large uncials, are employed in the MS. they are reproduced in the text; though, strangely enough, they are here omitted by Dr. Swainson. Compare Swainson, p. 78, col. 2, line 2, with Brightman, p. 318, col. 1, line 2.

4. Textual accuracy has now been achieved for the first time. Compare the list of instances on page 408 where the text of the Barberini MS. of the Greek Liturgy of St. Basil, as represented by Dr. Swainson, differs from the same as printed by Mr. Brightman. We have not, indeed, got the Barberini MS. in front of us to test the list by, but it would be a violation of the law of probability to suppose it possible that we have here, not a list of thirty-one inaccuracies in Swainson's text, but a list of thirty-one inaccuracies introduced into the text for the first time by Mr. Brightman. We do not say that the inaccuracies are of literary or doctrinal importance, but in a professed *verbatim* representation of a MS. text accuracy is to be commended and valued for its own sake.

We have taken the Greek Liturgy of St. Basil as a test case at haphazard, and it is not uncharitable to suppose that it may be accepted as a fair sample of the rest of the volume, and as a proof of the textual accuracy of Mr. Brightman's work as compared with that of his predecessor.

5. An alteration has been introduced into the mode of presenting Liturgies which exist in the Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, and other Oriental languages, ancient or modern. The ideal way would be, of course, to print each Liturgy in its own language. But the result would be an expensive volume, unintelligible to the vast majority of readers. How many graduates, for instance, of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge can read or understand Armenian? The plan adopted by most liturgical editors—*e.g.* Renaudot, Hammond, &c.—has been to present these Liturgies to their readers in a Latin translation. Mr. Brightman translates them into English, and

probably this is the fairest way, because such Latin words as *sacerdos, ara, &c.*, have, or may have, a history and usage of their own which do not equally belong either to the original

Swainson's Edition as corrected by Brightman's Edition.

Page.	Col.	Line.	
77	2	19	add τὴν δόξαν
"	"	32	add καὶ μεγαλοπρεπές
78	1	32	add ἀναπέμπωμεν
"	2	19	omit τοῖνον
79	1	5	omit ἄδοντα
"	"	7	add ἡμᾶς after κτίσας
"	"	8	omit ἡμᾶς after ἀγαγών
"	"	26	for ἐπίδε read ἐφίδε
"	"	31	omit ἐπίδε
"	2	11	add ὁ λαός. Ἄμην after Πνεύματι.
"	"	16	for ὁ διάκονος λέγει read λέγει ὁ διάκονος
80	2	1	for Χερουβὶμ read χερουβείμ.
"	"	2	for Σεραφίμ read σεραφείμ.
"	"	4	for κατακαλύπτουσι read κατακαλύπτουσιν
"	"	7	add τὸ after πρὸς
"	"	17	for τῇ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ read τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας.
"	"	28	after τε read αὐτόν.
"	"	33	for παλιγγενεσίας read παλιγγενεσίας
81	1	1	for ἔργα read ἔργων.
"	"	11	for ἦλθε read ἦλθεν
"	"	21	for σύμμορφος read σύνημορφος
"	"	23	for συμμόρφους read συνμόρφους
"	"	26	for εὐδόκησεν read ἠδόκησεν
"	2	18	for τὴν ἁμαρτίαν read τῆς ἁμαρτίας
"	"	21	omit σου

[Part of p. 81, the whole of pp. 82, 83, and the greater part of p. 84 are unrepresented in the Barberini MS., owing to an unfortunate *lacuna*. That MS., in its present condition, recommences after the first two syllables of ὀρθο]τομούντων, and not as Dr. Swainson indicates at Μνήσθητι.¹]

Page.	Col.	Line.	
85	1	11	add ἡμῖν after ἀναδείξας
"	2	28	add ὁ λαός. Ἄμην after πατρός.
86	1	12	omit square brackets.
"	"	19	add σου after λαῶ
"	"	23	add εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ
"	"	"	Πατρός after Εἰς ἅγιος.
"	2	14	omit square brackets.

¹ These missing pages have been supplied by Dr. Swainson from Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 22749, but not very accurately. See review in *Guardian* of July 30, 1884.

Armen
tion, or
special
lated,
confusi
Terms,
appalli
drinks
The
arrange
arrange
2, Alex
each cl
quick a
families
to Mr.
in both
pletion
Institut
grounds
be allow
Liturgie
geograp
haps; th
some les
extent o
some im
comes a
it. In t
infusion
munion,
James's,
and min
whole, th
having t
Liturgie
case, an
Eastern
will have
One
the text
Liturgy
Thus the
the Offe
Litany is

Armenian, Persian, &c., words, of which they are a translation, or to their English equivalents, priest, altar, &c. More special or less usual liturgical terms are sometimes not translated, but transliterated. The result would be sometimes confusing if it were not for an admirable Glossary of Technical Terms, which enables a reader at once to understand such an appalling rubric, at first sight, as '*When he [the Celebrant] drinks the deaconess, he says*' (p. 107, line 32).

The most important variation from Mr. Hammond's arrangement remains yet to be mentioned. The latter arranged Eastern Liturgies into three classes: 1, West Syrian; 2, Alexandrian; 3, East Syrian; the distinguishing mark of each class being the position of the Great Intercession for quick and dead. Mr. Brightman splits up Class 1 into two families—the Syrian rite, and the Byzantine rite. According to Mr. Hammond's test, they form one family or class, because in both of them the Great Intercession comes after the completion of the Consecration by the recital of the words of Institution, the Oblation, and the Invocation; but on other grounds the separation of this family into two families must be allowed to be justified. Linguistically, even when both Liturgies are Greek, the substance of the prayers is different; geographically, Constantinople is not in Syria, though, perhaps, this difficulty might have been got over by inventing some less narrow term than West Syrian to cover so broad an extent of ground; ritually, there are points of difference of some importance: *e.g.* in the Syrian rite the Kiss of Peace comes after the Creed; in the Byzantine rite it comes before it. In the latter rite there is the peculiar ceremony of the infusion of warm water into the chalice just before the Communion, which is not known to exist in the Syrian St. James's, or in any other Liturgy, Eastern or Western. Further and minor points of difference might be pointed out. On the whole, though we regret the increased complexity caused by having to recognize four instead of three families of Eastern Liturgies, yet we think that Mr. Brightman has proved his case, and that for the future his quadripartite division of Eastern Liturgies, and not Mr. Hammond's tripartite division, will have to be recognized and accepted.

One more most helpful alteration in the presentation of the text must not pass unnoticed. Synchronous portions of a Liturgy are presented in parallel columns, not consecutively. Thus the words and actions of the priest which are used at the Offertory in the Greek Liturgy of St. James, while the Litany is being chanted by the deacon, are placed side by

side with that Litany (pp. 43-47); and so elsewhere. Without this arrangement, it would be difficult for any person, not practically familiar with a Liturgy from his youth, to understand the exact order and sequence of the various parts of the service.

We have hitherto spoken only of the superior accuracy and plan of Mr. Brightman's work. Its chief value lies in the vast amount of liturgical information which is brought together—much of it for the first time—and for the skill with which it is marshalled and condensed, partly in the Introduction, partly in the seventeen Appendices at the end of the volume. Take one question only—a question of great difficulty and importance—the date, authorship, and *provenance* of the Clementine Liturgy, which, as the author points out, involves the date, authorship, and *provenance* of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, or, at least, of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in which it is embedded. No more important and no more complicated subject exists within the domain of liturgiology, or in connexion with any piece of early ecclesiastical literature. Ever since the popular belief in the Apostolic date and Apostolic authorship of these Constitutions was abandoned, at least by all persons of any literary acumen whatever, the most various theories have been entertained by the many scholars who have handled them. It is not worth while to recapitulate exploded theories, or even theories which, though still in the field, are bound to vanish before the latest positions won by the research of foreign scholars like Lagarde, Harnack, Funk, and of such ancient and modern English scholars as Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Lightfoot. Nothing shows, perhaps, Ussher's pre-eminence in learning, and his advance in front of his age, more than such a fact as this, that he was the first to make a suggestion which, after lying dormant for more than two centuries, has been at length accepted as a fact with regard to the origin of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, viz. that the compiler of them was identical with the Pseudo-Ignatius, the interpolator of the seven genuine epistles and the forger of the remaining six of the long recension of the Ignatian Epistles. The same person was also the compiler of the Canons at the close of the eighth book known as the *Apostolic Canons*.

The reasons for this conclusion are found in certain marked literary and theological characteristics which are admirably and clearly summarised by Mr. Brightman on pp. xiv-xxviii. The skill and clearness with which they are placed before the reader demand the highest praise, and the same remark refers

to the
the fol
compil
dox bu
nities,
latter
late or
sought
It is so
the Pse
Bright
bold en
is self-c
and the
much i
holding
Some p
must b
died in
purpos
enable

With
and sho
Pseudo
work.
recent y
treatme
organiz
word ha
and ma
availabl
before t
form in

Boo
a work
and onl
was prin
the text
lished b
1854);
ment, w
still a d
versions
in Euro
publicat

to the varied internal evidence brought together to substantiate the following positions or conclusions with regard to the same compiler and forger: namely, that he was 'a divine of unorthodox but otherwise not clearly determinable theological affinities, who wrote at Antioch or in its neighbourhood in the latter half of the fourth century.' We cannot here recapitulate or reprint the evidence for this statement. It must be sought and studied in Mr. Brightman's luminous Introduction. It is something to have discovered the home and the date of the Pseudo-Ignatius. Shall we ever discover his name? Mr. Brightman does not venture on a suggestion, and we are not bold enough to venture where he fears to tread. One thing is self-evident: a compiler and forger on such a large scale, and the successful launcher of interpolated documents of so much importance, must have been either a bishop or a person holding some other high and influential ecclesiastical position. Some person of literary skill and slightly heretical tendency must be found like Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa, who, however, died in A.D. 360, some quarter of a century too early for the purpose, and enough of whose writings have not survived to enable any sure inference to be based upon them.

With equal skill and clearness Mr. Brightman enumerates and shortly describes the original materials out of which the Pseudo-Ignatius expanded and upon which he compiled his work. These materials have either only come to light in recent years, or have only in recent years begun to receive the treatment which they deserve at the hands of students of the organization and worship of the early Church. The last word has by no means been said about them; but the pith and marrow of what has been said, and the cream of all available information about them is dished up and placed before the reader in a most compact but also most digestible form in pp. xviii-xxiv of the Introduction.

Books I.-VI. are based upon the *Didaskalia Apostolorum*, a work produced in Syria in the first half of the third century, and only known at present to exist in a Syrian version which was printed by Lagarde (Leipzig, 1854). A reconstruction of the text in Greek was made by Lagarde for Bunsen, and published by the latter in his *Analecta Ante-Nicæna* (London, 1854); but a critical edition of this important Syriac document, with a Latin, English, or German translation of it, is still a desideratum in theological literature. Probably early versions of it in some other language than Syriac are lurking in European libraries, and only waiting for discovery and publication.

Book VII. 1-32 is expanded from the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, the well-known work of the second, if not of the end of the first, century.

Book VII. 33-49 is, so far as is known, the work of the compiler, including certain portions of Holy Scripture within its limits.

Book VIII. 1-2 perhaps includes an otherwise lost book of St. Hippolytus *Περὶ χαρισμάτων*.

Book VIII. 3-27, including the Clementine Liturgy, is the arrangement, though not entirely the composition, of the compiler.

Book VIII. 28-46 is a collection of directions and formulæ found in certain other early documents, the relationship of which to one another has not been ascertained, and which perhaps, with the present materials for judging, cannot be yet ascertained.

Book VIII. 47, containing the Apostolic Canons, is derived partly from the Canons of the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 341), partly from the *Apostolic Constitutions* themselves, as its main sources. The sources are not completely known, but it has been ascertained that twenty Canons are derived from those of Antioch (A.D. 341), eighteen from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, six from the Canons of Nice (A.D. 325), and three from those of Laodicea (A.D. 361).

The other early documents referred to as akin to Book VIII. 28-46, though their exact relationship to each other and to the *Apostolic Constitutions* needs further elucidation, are :

(1) A document, which bears no special name, but which appears in many MSS. and in various shapes, about the origin, authorship, dates, and character of which different opinions have been held by leading modern authorities. These opinions have been admirably summarized by Mr. Brightman in the small print paragraphs on p. 20, but his opinion is that 'perhaps the only view of it which is possible at present, is one which regards it as a preliminary draft of the eighth book by the hand of the compiler himself, or an excerpt from such a form.'

(2) The *Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons*, cc. 63-79, of which Boheiric and Arabic MS. versions also exist, form a document substantially coincident with, but exhibiting variations from, the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

(3) A Syriac document, published by Lagarde from a Paris MS. (*S. Germ.* 38), under the name of the *Clementine Octateuch*, but practically an excerpt from the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

(4) *Sahidic* of the but w Mr. B

(5) 21-71

ing, w Canon eighth

(6) bution of the and of ultima Consti

The ous w author do not is to b The la has no ties va and 6, materi nected whole Mr. Bri duction

The Introdu liturgic portanc

We Appen of some ness to Dr. Pro howeve some ca Mr. Bri the suc The be foun

(4) The *Egyptian Church Ordinances*, forming cc. 31-62 of *Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons*. This document contains much of the matter in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but with variation of detail and order, and is considered by Mr. Brightman to be a source, or akin to a source, of that book.

(5) The *Ethiopic Church Ordinances*, forming Statutes 21-71 of the *Ethiopic Statutes of the Apostles*, and corresponding, with variations, to cc. 31-62 of the *Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons*. The variations point to their being earlier than the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

(6) The *Canons of Hippolytus*, which, though their attribution to St. Hippolytus is not proven, are a body of Canons of the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, and of Roman origin, are the source of (4) and (5), and ultimately through them of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

The above are the documents older than or contemporaneous with, or possibly in some cases, according to some authorities, more recent than, the *Apostolic Constitutions*. We do not believe that so clear and succinct an account of them is to be found in any other book in the English language. The last word indeed has not been said about them. No. 5 has not been fully published or translated. Eminent authorities vary in their estimates of the date and position of Nos. 1 and 6, but anyone wishing to possess a clear account of the materials which exist up to date for settling questions connected with the origin of the Clementine Liturgy and of the whole of the *Apostolic Constitutions* must possess himself of Mr. Brightman's volume and master the contents of his Introduction.

Thus it will be seen that the range of Mr. Brightman's Introduction extends beyond the strict border line of liturgiology, and discusses questions of the greatest importance concerning many early ecclesiastical documents.

We have already referred to the seventeen valuable Appendices which follow the liturgical texts. For the material of some of them Mr. Brightman acknowledges his indebtedness to predecessors in the same field of labour, such as Goar, Dr. Probst, Mr. Hammond, &c. Many of these Appendices, however, present material all but inaccessible before, and in some cases now printed for the first time; and even where Mr. Brightman makes use of the previous labours of others, the succinctness and lucidity of arrangement are all his own.

The catalogue of subjects treated in these Appendices will be found on p. 460. They cover the whole field of liturgical

information (barring future discoveries) which lies behind the Barberini MS. so far as that ground can be covered by extant liturgical fragments and by gleanings from the writings of Eastern writers before the ninth century. We cannot discuss each Appendix with the fulness which it deserves, but will call attention to a few of the earlier and more important of them.

Appendix A gives us in an English translation the full text of the liturgical forms of the *Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons*, Their relationship to the *Apostolic Constitutions* is uncertain, but they are a document of about the same date, and their inclusion is a matter of importance, especially as Archdeacon Tattam's translation is possessed by few, is probably now unpurchasable, and is not so accurate as the translation now offered by Mr. Brightman.

Appendix B gives us the construction, with some of the wording, of the Palestinian Liturgy in the fourth century drawn from the well-known *Procatechesis* and the *Catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, with copious notes and illustrations drawn from St. Jerome, the *Passio S. Procopii*, and especially from the recently discovered and not hitherto fully utilized *Peregrinatio S. Sylviæ*, and from other authors and sources.

Appendix C reconstructs the Antiochene Liturgy of the latter part of the fourth century, with copious illustrative notes, from the writings of St. Chrysostom. In drawing up this important Appendix the editor had the previous work of Dr. Probst and Mr. Hammond to start upon, but he here for the first time completely disentangles St. Chrysostom's evidence for Antioch from his evidence for the liturgical forms in use at Constantinople, and this lends a special value and additional importance to this Appendix.

Appendix D accumulates evidence for the character of the Syrian Liturgy from the fifth to the eighth century. It is chiefly, but by no means exclusively, drawn from the writings of such comparatively little known authors as Hesychius the Presbyter, Cyril of Scythopolis, S. Anastasius Sinaita, as well as from St. John of Damascus, and Joannes Moschus.

We need not go further and fill pages with a mere recapitulation of the valuable material contained in the remaining thirteen Appendices. Not one of them is superfluous or unwelcome. All of them testify in different degrees to features in Mr. Brightman's volume, which perhaps may be regarded as specially attested by the work involved in Appendix D: namely, industry, exactness, and completeness. We find that whereas in certain Appendices he has merely had to utilize and rearrange material collected by predecessors

in the
parts
placed
pletem
depart
to-day
the d
withi
himse
possib
which
kind,
events
of the
quotat
writen
pp. 50
on p.
beginn
p. lxx
Orient
or mor
has be
Where
for m
includ
would
added
that th
added
and al
or use
things.
On
capabl
the Gr
have n
ment o
Biblica
He
favour
may su
by such
that th
the co

in the field of liturgiology, in Appendix D as well as in other parts of the work he has collected fresh material and has placed it before his readers for the first time. Absolute completeness is of course unattainable in this or in any other department of literature. If completeness were attained to-day it might become incompleteness to-morrow, owing to the discovery of further material or other MSS. But within the limits which Mr. Brightman has imposed upon himself, and considering only the material with which it was possible for him to deal, he has produced an ideal handbook, which is a great advance on previous attempts of the same kind, admirable and useful as they were, and which at all events approximates to completeness. As further examples of the qualities referred to, we might call attention to the quotations in illustration of the Egyptian Liturgy culled from writers of the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh centuries on pp. 506-9; to the exhaustive list of MSS. of the Syrian rite on p. lx, and to many similar points. Very useful, too, to beginners will be the description of Greek service books on p. lxxxii, and the general belief in the inelasticity of the Oriental rite will be somewhat shaken by the list of the nine or more different languages into which the Byzantine Liturgy has been translated, and in which it exists in use (p. lxxxix). Where so much help has been given it may seem hard to ask for more, but would that there had been a general Index, including within itself both subjects and proper names! It would have been a gigantic compilation, and would have added to the bulk of the volume, and one can well imagine that the editor shrank from it, but it would certainly have added to the usefulness of the volume both to the beginner and also to the more advanced investigator of the history or use or frequency of liturgical terms, ideas, persons, and things.

One passage in the Preface seems to us to be possibly capable of misinterpretation. The author says on p. xi, 'In the Greek texts I have marked as a quotation anything I have noticed as agreeing with any reading in the New Testament or the LXX; but it is possible that in some cases the Biblical reading is derived from the liturgical text.'

He must not be suspected of meaning that he is in favour of the strange (we might almost say the absurd; we may surely say the impossible) theory advanced or supported by such high authority as Dr. Neale and Mr. Gerard Moultrie, that the composition of some of the Liturgies is earlier than the composition of the books of the New Testament, and

that certain passages found in the latter are quotations from the former. We fear, however, that the mediæval belief in the Apostolic origin of certain Liturgies is not universally exploded yet, and that Mr. Brightman may live to see his Preface quoted in its support. Yet his real meaning is so obvious that we will not insult the intelligence of our readers by explaining it here.

The book is singularly free from misprints. There are certain inferences or suggestions made in the course of the voluminous notes on which opinions may freely differ; they are on points of minute importance, and it would be captious to dwell upon them here. In passing, however, may we ask the editor if the definition of 'Trisagion' on p. 590 covers the use of the same word on p. 482? On p. 479, n. 22, he quotes from the *De Proditione Judæ* famous words of St. Chrysostom which attribute the force of consecration to the words of Institution, and which seem to stand alone among the writings of Eastern Fathers and among the texts of Eastern Liturgies in so doing, the prevailing tendency of Eastern theology being to attribute the consecrating force to the epiklesis of the Holy Spirit. These words are bracketed by Mr. Ffoulkes as spurious,¹ or at all events as not representing the doctrine of St. Chrysostom, and as probably being due to Eusebius of Emesa. It would take too long to reproduce and discuss the arguments of Mr. Ffoulkes, and to weigh their value. Probably, as there appears to be no textual evidence against their genuineness, Mr. Brightman did not feel himself at liberty to treat them as otherwise than genuine, or even to hint at the doubt which has been cast upon them.

Some remarks of a general character suggest themselves as we rise from the perusal of a volume which, though not a complete Eastern *Codex Liturgicus*, tells us all that can be told at present with regard to the origins and the earliest forms and gradual growth of the Liturgies of Eastern Christendom.

(a) The dearth of early liturgical MSS. The West is better provided than the East in this respect.

If we except such fragments as that of the Persian rite printed in Appendix L, and some others, we have no text of any completeness earlier than the Barberini MS. of the Byzantine rite c. A.D. 800. In the case of the other Eastern rites the absence of early MSS. is still more marked: e.g. for the Syrian rite Mr. Brightman has to print the Greek Liturgy of St. James from a fourteenth century MS., and the Syriac

¹ *Primitive Consecration*, London, 1885, p. 172.

Liturg
the fif
modern
of the
and the
the th
equally
Liturg
and the
teenth
to pres
book.
culty o
of Arn
the cou
quity o
by the
would
upon th
in our
century
collecte
Bright
knowle
than m
survivin

(b)
all the
the Lit
in the l
up the
extrem
is not
Liturg
or othe
with its
name o
in part,
does no
rite, bu
'Ephes
point w
be glad
Wester

(c)

Liturgy of St. James from MSS. varying from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, with the inter-mixture of even more modern material still. In the Egyptian rite the earliest MS. of the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark is of the twelfth century, and the earliest MS. of the Coptic Liturgy of St. Mark is of the thirteenth century. Ethiopia and Armenia are in an equally bad or in a still worse position. The Ethiopic Liturgy has to be translated from a seventeenth century MS., and though there are Armenian liturgical MSS. of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Mr. Brightman thinks it well to present a translation from a nineteenth century service book. Possibly the corruptness of the MSS. and the difficulty of obtaining a reliable translation in the present dearth of Armenian scholars may have influenced him in adopting the course which he has here pursued. Of course the antiquity of a liturgical prayer or rubric is by no means settled by the earliest extant MS. copy of it. The Old Testament would be a very modern composition if its date depended upon the date of extant MSS., and with the Clementine Liturgy in our hands, which can be referred safely to the fourth century, and with the mass of information and allusion collected together and printed in these Appendices by Mr. Brightman, we are in a much better position to obtain a knowledge of the character and contents of Eastern Liturgies than might be inferred from a mere glance at the dates of surviving MSS.

(b) In Appendices M and N we have in a collected form all the evidence which can be produced as to the character of the Liturgy of Asia Minor both in the Diocesis of Asia and in the Diocesis or Exarchate of Pontus, which together made up the whole of that country. The evidence is of an extremely fragmentary character, but so far as it goes, and it is not likely to increase in quantity or to go further, the Liturgy of Asia does not betray any signs of affinity, parental or otherwise, to the early Gallican Liturgy which, together with its sister Liturgy of Spain, has commonly borne the name of Ephesine, from its supposed derivation, in whole or in part, from Asia Minor. The absence of signs of affinity does not absolutely disprove the Asiatic origin of the Gallican rite, but it at least justifies the modern dislike of the epithet 'Ephesine' as begging the question. This is no doubt a point which Mr. Brightman will discuss, and which we shall be glad to hear him discuss in his forthcoming volume on Western Liturgies.

(c) There is a very curious and, whether genuine or not,

important liturgical tractate or treatise entitled *Λόγος περὶ παραδόσεως τῆς θείας λειτουργίας*, or *De Traditione divine Missæ*, attributed to St. Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople, and to the year 446. It is printed as such by Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, tom. lxxv. col. 849. Whether all the statements contained in it are true or not, it seems to us to be a document of much interest and importance, and we wish that Mr. Brightman had devoted an Appendix to it, and told us something more of his opinion as to its value and date, instead of making but a passing reference to it (and that a reference of somewhat uncertain sound) on p. xlv.

Several interesting subjects for investigation are suggested by Mr. Brightman's volume. We will content ourselves with mentioning, and to a limited extent handling, one of them. How far, in the course of the last eleven hundred years, has the text of the Eastern Liturgies been altered? and what is the nature of such alterations as have taken place? Such questions can only be asked—or rather, can only be answered—in the case of the Byzantine family, for in no other family of Eastern Liturgies are there MSS. in existence covering so long a period of time. But the famous Barberini MS. was written in A.D. 800, and we can compare the Byzantine Greek Liturgy of that date with the same Liturgy as it is in use to-day. In making such a comparison, we must avoid falling into the common mistake into which, as Mr. Brightman points out, even Dr. Swainson has fallen,¹ of inferring that everything in the printed text of to-day which is not found in the older MS. text is therefore a development or addition. Such is not the case. The old liturgical MS. contains only the priest's part, or little else besides; the rubrics, the responses, the deacon's part, so much larger and more important in the East than in the West, together with certain variable elements, are to be sought in the *Τυπικόν*, the *Ἱεροδιακονικόν*, and the other liturgical volumes usefully and carefully described by Mr. Brightman on p. lxxxii. Just in the same way in handling Western service books it would be a mistake to compare the *Missale plenarium* of to-day with a Sacramentary of the tenth century or earlier, which contained only the celebrant's part, and to infer that the elaborate arrangements as to vestments, incense, and other points of ritual not mentioned in the latter are therefore the upgrowth of the intervening centuries. The *Ordines Romani*, the *Graduals* and other books must be examined to find out the history of the rubrics, the ritual,

¹ *The Greek Liturgies*, London, 1884, p. 148. See Mr. Brightman's volume, p. lxxxiv.

and the
legitim
strictly
the pri
the tex
have p
Liturg
Th

This s
the slig
whatev
altere
purely
τῆς ἀγ
πεῖρα κ.
of the
some u
pronou
as δέσσ
tival ep
become
τίμιον

Lea
having
gical o
the cas
place.
tioned
in the t

1. I
the wh
δοῦλόν
ἀπὸ συ
special

2. I
με ἐκ π
με ἐκ π
sentime
yet we
confusio

3. I
εἰ ὁ προ
μενος,
δεχόμεν
of this

and the variable parts of the service. All that we can do legitimately by the aid of the older MSS. of the Liturgy, strictly and technically so called, is to compare the text of the priest's part of a thousand years ago, more or less, with the text of the priest's part as it stands in print to-day. We have performed this operation on the text of the Greek Liturgy of St. Basil, and present our readers with the result.

There are in round numbers about fifty variations of text. This sounds a large number, but the majority of them are of the slightest possible importance, or rather of no importance whatever. Some are purely orthographical, such as *σεραφείμ* altered to *σεραφίμ*, *σύνμορφος* to *σύμμορφος*, &c.; some are purely grammatical, e.g. *οὐκ ἔστιν μέτρον τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας τῆς ἀγιοσύνης σου* is altered to *οὐκ ἔστι μέτρον τῇ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ κ.τ.λ.* Others consist of merely a variation in the order of the words used; others of the addition or omission of some unimportant words, generally a particle, an article, or a pronoun, occasionally a substantive in the vocative case, such as *δέσποτα* or *κύριε*, in one case only of an additional adjectival epithet, *τὸ ἅγιόν σου σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα* having become amplified into *τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἄχραντόν σου σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα*.

Leaving, then, all such cases as the above on one side as having, except perhaps in the last quoted instance, no liturgical or even literary importance whatever, let us pass on to the cases where a noteworthy change of reading has taken place. They are so few in number that they may be mentioned and briefly discussed in the order in which they occur in the text.

1. In the prayer of the Cherubic Hymn (p. 318, line 23) the whole of the following sentence has been added after *δοῦλόν σου*: '*καὶ καθάρισον μου τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν καρδίαν ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς.*' It is an addition which has no special theological significance.

2. In the same prayer (lines 30, 31) '*μηδὲ ἀποδοκιμάσης με ἐκ ποδῶν σου*' has been altered into '*μηδὲ ἀποδοκιμάσης με ἐκ παίδων σου.*' 'Spurn me not from thy feet' is a different sentiment from 'Exclude me not from among thy children'; yet we cannot but think that the change is solely due to a confusion between two similar words, *ποδῶν* and *παίδων*.

3. In the same prayer, in the important passage '*Σὺ γὰρ εἰ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος καὶ ἀγιάζων καὶ ἀγιαζόμενος,*' the last four words have been changed into *καὶ προσδεχόμενος καὶ διαδιδόμενος*. It is not easy to see the reason of this change. Both statements are theologically true.

Perhaps the latter phrase is rather easier of interpretation than the former.

4. In the intercessions accompanying the diptychs of the living the curious epithet *εἰρηνικούς* has been omitted in the following sentence, 'ὁμβρους εἰρηνικούς τῇ γῇ πρὸς καρποφορίαν δώρησαι' (p. 337, l. 3). It may well have been omitted on the ground of the difficulty of placing a rational interpretation upon it.

5. In the prayer introductory to the Lord's Prayer the word *μερίδα* has been substituted for *ἐλπίδα* in the passage 'δὸς ἡμῖν . . . ἀξίως ὑποδέχεσθαι τὴν ἐλπίδα τῶν ἁγιασμάτων σου' (p. 339, l. 4). The reason of this change is plain—*μερίδα* is a much more natural word to use and an easier word to explain in the sentence in question.

6. In the prayer just before Communion the words 'καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου' have been added to the words 'ἐξ ἁγίου κατοικητηρίου σου' (p. 341, l. 7). This is merely an instance of verbal enrichment, and is destitute of any other significance.

We now come to the two concluding prayers of the Liturgy, which exhibit great variation of text. They are hardly part of the Liturgy itself, but coming after the dismissal, and being said, the first in the middle of the nave and the second in the sacristy, have been looked upon as appendages to the Liturgy, and as liable to freer handling in the matter of alteration and adaptation. We have printed them in parallel columns, exhibiting in the second column the alterations from the earlier text:

(7) Εὐχὴ ὀπισθάμβωνος.

Barberini Codex, A.D. 800.

Ad normam hodie acceptam.

κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν	Ἄξιως ὑποδέχεσθαι τὴν ἐλπίδα τῶν ἁγιασμάτων σου
σῶσον τὸν λαόν σου,	ὁμβρους εἰρηνικούς τῇ γῇ πρὸς καρποφορίαν δώρησαι
καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου.	καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου
τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ διαφύλαξον	ἐξ ἁγίου κατοικητηρίου σου
ἀγίασον τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας τὴν εὐπρέπειαν τοῦ οἴκου σου	ἐξ ἁγίου κατοικητηρίου σου
σὺ αὐτοὺς ἀντιδόξασον τῇ θεϊκῇ δυνάμει, καὶ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπὶ σοί· εἰρήνην τῷ κόσμῳ σου δώρησαι, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σου, τοῖς ἱερέσιν, τοῖς βασιλευσιν ἡμῶν, καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ σου.	καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου

ὅτι ἅγιος ὁ
δικαιωσὶν

καὶ σοὶ τῇ

ἀναπέμπον

τῷ Πατρὶ

Πνεύματι

νῦν καὶ ἀεί

αἰώνων.

Ἦνυσται

τῇ ἡμετέ

ἔθου ἡμ

τὰ τῆς ἀφ

ἡρώμεν τ

ἔδαμεν τ

τύπον,

ἐνεπλήσθη

τρυνφῆς

ἀπηλαύσα

ζωῆς

ἥς καὶ ἐν

τυχεῖν

Χριστῇ ὁ

ὅτι πρέπει

τῷ ἀνάγ

αγίῳ κ

πνεύματι

νῦν καὶ ἀεί

αἰώνων.

This

neither

which w

independ

extreme

and in p

It w

exactly

crept in

publicly

Lady I

! The

Swainson

of ἀνάρχο

ὅτι ἅγιος ὁ λαός σου, θαυμαστὸς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ	ὅτι πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθή, καὶ πᾶν ὄρημα τέλειον ἄνωθέν ἐστιν, κατὰβαινον ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων
καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν	<i>id.</i> , but add καὶ εὐχαριστίαν καὶ προσκύνησιν
ἀναπέμπομεν	<i>id.</i>
τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι	<i>id.</i>
νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.	<i>id.</i>
(8) Εὐχὴ τοῦ σκενοφυλακίου.	
Ἦνυσται καὶ τετέλεσται ὅσον εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν δύναμιν πάντα ἅπερ ἔθου ἡμῖν	<i>id.</i> but after δύναμιν substitute Χριστὲ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν τὸ τῆς σῆς οἰκονομίας μυστήριον
τὰ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας μυστήρια ἡγάγμεν τοῦ θανάτου σου μνήμην	ἔχομεν γὰρ τοῦ θανάτου σου τὴν μνήμην
εἶδαμεν τῆς ἀναστάσεώς σου τὸν τύπον,	<i>id.</i>
ἐνεπλήσθημεν τῆς ἀκενώτου σου τρυφῆς	ἐνεπλήσθημεν τῆς ἀτελεντήτου σου ζωῆς
ἀπηλαύσαμεν τῆς ἀτελεντήτου σου ζωῆς	ἀπηλαύσαμεν τῆς ἀκενώτου σου τρυφῆς
ἥς καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι πάντας ἡμᾶς τυχεῖν καταξιώσων	<i>id.</i> , but after μέλλοντι add αἰῶνι. καταξιωθῆναι εὐδόκησον.
Χριστὲ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.	<i>omit.</i>
ὅτι πρέπει σοι πᾶσα εὐχαριστία σὺν τῷ ἀνάρχῳ σου πατρὶ καὶ τῷ παναγίῳ καὶ ἀγαθῷ καὶ ζωοποιῷ σου πνεύματι	χάριτι τοῦ ἀνάρχου ¹ σου Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σου Πνεύματος
νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.	νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

This completes the list of variations of text. They are neither numerous nor important, and they enforce the fact, which we should have expected to be the fact on other and independent grounds, that the Greek Church has been extremely conservative in guarding her liturgical language, and in preserving her Liturgies from change.

It would be an interesting point if we could discover exactly when the changes of text above enumerated either crept into the Liturgy of St. Basil, or were formally and publicly introduced into it. An examination of the text of Lady Burdett Coutts' MS. iii. 42, as published by Dr.

¹ The eleventh century MS. of St. Basil's Liturgy as printed by Swainson from Lady Burdett Coutts' MS. iii. 42 reads ἀρχάντων instead of ἀνδρχου (*Greek Liturgies*, p. 171).

Swainson (*Greek Liturgies*, pp. 151-171), proves with regard to changes (1) (2) (3) (6) (7) (8) that they are at least as old as the eleventh century. We can arrive at no conclusion as to (4) and (5) because, unfortunately, Dr. Swainson has not printed in full those parts of the text of St. Basil's Liturgy in which they occur, and we have no opportunity of access at this moment to Lady Burdett Coutts' MS.

We have not pursued this inquiry in regard to the development of other texts, either of Byzantine or of other Eastern Liturgies. A collation of texts of different dates is a work yet to be done. Some enthusiastic and competent liturgist will no doubt some day do it. Will Mr. Brightman? We hope not until he has completed his more important task of launching before an expectant and appreciative, if limited public, his second volume, on Western Liturgies.

ART. X.—CHURCH'S 'OCCASIONAL PAPERS.'

Occasional Papers selected from the 'Guardian,' the 'Times,' and the 'Saturday Review,' 1846-1890. By the late R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.C.L., sometime Rector of Whatley, Dean of St. Paul's, Honorary Fellow of Oriel College. Two vols. (London, 1897.)

THE preface which Miss Church has written to these volumes shows how large a contributor to periodical literature the late Dean of St. Paul's was. An incomplete list of the reviews and articles which he wrote for the *Guardian* numbers over a thousand. From 1846 to 1871 he appears to have contributed to that newspaper one or more articles as well as a review every week. He wrote also for the *Times*, and was a regular contributor to the *Saturday Review*. We may add that articles from his pen occasionally appeared in the *British Critic*, the *Christian Remembrancer*, and our own pages.

Two years ago¹ we ventured to express our regret that there was no *magnum opus* by Dean Church. Our opinion on that point has not been modified by some criticisms of it which have come under our notice. We recognize, indeed, the high value of the literary work which the Dean actually did. We are not blind to the immense influence which must have been exercised on English thought by the continual appearing of articles from his pen in the *Guardian* and the

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1895, p. 102.

Satur
is that
or by s
remain
of the
culable

The
have be
excepti
written
touchin
history
Englan
form the
which th
series of

To g
by the
'Stanley
'Thierry
'Jansen
on the
'Mr. Gl
Lecture
Parochi
are the
titles wo
papers.
actually
the subj

The
the *Gua*
unlike n
judgmen
a greater
full and
on Carly
stand, b
disposed
Rather,
side of t
of chara
review v
of the m
Dean C

Saturday Review, to say nothing of the *Times*. Our sorrow is that it was not possible for him, either in addition to these or by some limitation of them, to write what might have remained as a standard work of permanent value. A History of the Papacy from his pen might have been of quite incalculable service to the Church.

The two volumes contain fifty-four papers, all of which have been published as articles or reviews with 'the one exception' of 'the "Fragment on Elizabeth," which was written in 1889, and is included here among other papers touching on various aspects of the ecclesiastical and political history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, abroad and in England' (Preface, p. vi). This 'fragment' was intended to form the 'opening chapter to a volume on Queen Elizabeth which the Dean had undertaken to contribute to Mr. Morley's series of English Statesmen' (i. 401).

To glance through the titles of the papers is to be struck by the versatility of the writer. 'Carlyle's Cromwell,' 'Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church,' 'Epictetus,' 'Thierry's St. Jerome,' 'Dean Milman's Essays,' 'Guicciardini,' 'Jansenist Expositions of Scripture,' 'Lamennais,' 'Döllinger on the Reunion of Christendom,' 'Brewer's Henry VIII.,' 'Mr. Gladstone on the Royal Supremacy,' 'Mozley's Bampton Lectures,' 'Ecce Homo,' 'Life of Baron Bunsen,' 'Newman's Parochial Sermons'—these are sufficient to show how varied are the subjects treated. With some writers such a list of titles would at once arouse suspicion as to the worth of the papers. With Dean Church we expect to find, and we do actually find, that the treatment is as deep and thoughtful as the subjects are various.

The opening paper, which consists of three reviews from the *Guardian* on 'Carlyle's Cromwell,' is in some ways very unlike much of Dean Church's work. The style of it, in our judgment, differs much from most of his writings, but there is a greater difference in the fact that it makes no attempt at a full and fair estimate of Cromwell. As a severe attack both on Carlyle's book and on Cromwell himself it has, we understand, been subjected to some adverse criticism. We are not disposed to regard it as either vindictive or unthinking. Rather, as it seems to us, it is a deliberate setting out of one side of things, chosen purposely, instead of a complete estimate of character, from a sense that the immediate need, when the review was written, was such an emphasis on a particular part of the matter. We should not ourselves now write all that Dean Church then said about Cromwell, but we are not clear

that the method which he adopted may not have been that best calculated to expose the faults of Carlyle's book and the fancy character of the portrait of Cromwell which he had drawn. Where it does differ from what Dean Church generally wrote is, not in any trace of intentional unfairness or bad temper, but in his resting satisfied without the complete and careful allowance for every factor which a problem contains.

For the most part, the characteristic features of Dean Church's work appear in the present volumes. We are accustomed to look for his balance of thought, and we find an instance of it in the recognition of the value of scientific inquiry, side by side with a clear sense of the limitations of science, in the review on Lyell's *Explanations: a Sequel to 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation,'* a review which, as it is worth while to notice, he wrote in the year 1846. Thus, almost at the end of the review, there is this striking passage:

'If science is to advance, it must be cultivated freely: if it is to be more than a vestibule to the workshop, it must be cultivated not only freely but philosophically, by minds trained to appreciate harmony and greatness in system as well as arrangement in details. And if moral truths and religion are not to suffer, it must be, not by allying them with the physical sciences, but by defining with breadth and precision of thought the impassable limits between the moral and the physical; by maintaining the substantive independence of those two incommensurables—on the one hand, the free will and thought of men, and on the other the sequences of nature. Keep in view the great principle that belief in God does not depend upon the natural; that nature is not the real basis of religion, and we can safely afford full and free scope to science. . . . In a world of widening and self-sustained order, an Epicurean Atheism is not so difficult: something deeper than the facts of natural science is required to undercut its premises. It is the metaphysician, the abstract thinker, who is wanting in the field. It is not special pleading, or timid, indecisive fighting about details, which will meet the march of that science which openly threatens to be infidel because no one will help it to be Christian' (i. 64-5).

The great justice of the Dean's mind appears again and again. His strong sense of the weak points in Dean Stanley's work does not hinder him from expressing a very high opinion of the real merits of his *Lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History* as showing forcibly the 'purely human side,' the 'scenic and dramatic,' 'personal and individual' elements in the history of the Church (i. 67, 71). In the same way, while he lays great stress on the natural features of the Bible history.

which
History
on the
throw o

'The
ing as i
Incarnat
the high
events u
world or
for and
miracles
any othe
different
be expect
of course
records
chose th
stood an
know of
ferently
Son of
impress
preceden
the assum
are imp
Abraham
alleged i
links in t
flesh," an
system o
is reflect
them fro
done by
world' (i

'It is
standing
and mor
speaking
this. T
work, if
the mod
lands; b
whether
thing un
binding
Sinai; it
code pro
a desert

VOL.

which are emphasized in the same writer's *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, there is a very valuable passage on the light which the Incarnation and the Resurrection throw on the character of the Old Testament :

'The history of the Old Testament wears a different aspect according as it is simply looked at in itself or as it is connected with the Incarnation and Resurrection of the Son of God. These were, in the highest and fullest sense, which nothing can get over, miracles ; events utterly different from anything else that we know of in the world or in history. A course of things which was a preparation for and part of such events as these, as it confessedly runs on into miracles without parallel and analogy, is on a different level from any other history in the world. A different scale of probability, a different standard of judgment in many important particulars, may be expected to apply to it. It is a question of fact and evidence, of course, in each case, not to be settled *a priori*, of what nature its records are, what they really say, what really happened, how God chose that the occurrences of that preparatory time should be understood and transmitted—how much, in fact, we are permitted to know of that early history. But as God dealt with the world differently from all the ordinary ways of His dealing with it when the Son of God was made flesh and rose from the dead, the mind, impressed with these miracles, is not surprised to find the whole precedent history pervaded with the supernatural, and marked with the assumption of the miraculous. It is this that ordinary readers are impressed with in the Old Testament history. The Call of Abraham and the miracles of Moses do not stand alone as separate alleged instances of Divine interposition ; they are felt as steps and links in the train of working which went on till "the Word was made flesh," and the Crucified arose from the dead. They belong to a system of things of which these last wonders are a part. On them is reflected from these latter a Divine character which separates them from all other things which could happen to men, or have been done by men, not thus linked with the coming of God into the world' (i. 77-8).

'It is doubtless true that there are coarse gross ways of understanding the Divine dealings, and that very often it is more religious and more reverent to abstain from precise assertions when we are speaking of the ways and works of God. But there are limits to this. The Call of Abraham would have been equally a Divine work, if it had been like the call which summons a missionary of the modern world to devote his life to carrying truth to strange lands ; but it is idle to say that it makes no difference to our thoughts whether the Call of Abraham was something more than this, something *unlike* all our experience. The Decalogue would have been as binding on the conscience of man even if it had not been given on Sinai ; it would have been almost as wonderful if it had been the code produced by the enlightenment and elevation of the leader of a desert tribe of those days ; but it is unreasonable to say that, if it

is indeed the monument of a direct communication between God and man, it is the same thing in interest and importance as if it had been something thought out by the spirit of man under the influence, as we know it now, of the Author of all goodness and wisdom. And so with other things. Parts of the Bible history may have been read and understood as supernatural, which are either purely natural or what we call providential. But the great hinges of it are more than this. No arguments in favour of indefinite rather than too limited and literal views, no warnings against narrow and human conceptions of God's ways, can get rid of the presence of the miraculous. Not only is it interwoven with the very sense and reason of the history, but it is indissolubly linked with that of which the life of our Lord was the climax. Let us learn where we were wrong in supposing a miracle. But it is not philosophical nor religious to shrink from the miraculous, as such, if it really comes before us; to be content to subordinate it to the providential, or to hold up the providential so as to obscure it' (i. 81-2).

The Dean is no less just in estimating the characters of great men of history or the significance of a particular series of events than he is in reviewing a modern writer or insisting that due weight must be given to all considerations which bear on the Old Testament records. There is an instance of his treatment of an individual in the paper entitled 'Thierry's St. Jerome.' St. Jerome is one of those of whom it is easy to form an unjust estimate in one direction or another. He has been subjected to indiscriminate praise and to indiscriminate abuse. From either point of view the real complexity of his character, mixing remarkable weaknesses with remarkable elements of strength, has been lost sight of. We can forgive M. Thierry his failure to grasp what St. Jerome was like, since it supplied the occasion of Dean Church's interesting review and most just estimate.

'St. Jerome,' he says, 'is one of whom it is impossible to write with reality and justice unless plenty of room is made for his ruggedness, irritability, and coarseness, and for the odd and ludicrous contrasts between the ideal of saintliness and the matter-of-fact outbursts of his ultra-Johnsonian roughness and impetuosity of temper. . . . What is wanted is to do real justice to a very remarkable man—remarkable in his self-dedication to religion and study, and remarkable also in his fierce energy, and coarse loves and hates; to be sensible of his ungovernable rudeness and extravagance, and of its abundant grotesqueness and frequent repulsiveness, yet to be alive also to the strength and unselfish laboriousness of that robust and indefatigable nature' (i. 128-9).

'Jerome, the Romanized Provincial, the harsh and violent Dalmatian in blood, the Roman in artificial culture, but utterly without taste or justice or moderation, one of those products of the contact

of his
in his
ascetic
direct
charac
enthus
withou
result
same
much
ter so

And
be see
been f
lives o
the em
life, th

'As
been g
the Cru
and re
pupil's
a life o
dazzlin
of histo
than ha
torch o
warning
ing all
purpose
tempted
them, in
which,
back, a
teacher,
meddles
of his p
and dan

Or,
'the m
much, a
and con
Henry's
tist' (i.

Pas
men or

of high civilization with ambitious and aspiring barbarism so common in his day and not unknown in our own, was a combination of the ascetic, the student and critic, the satirist and pamphleteer, and the director and guide of aristocratic religious ladies. When all these characters were grafted on a nature in the highest degree passionate, enthusiastic, inexhaustible in its rough vigour, self-confident, and without the faintest notion of checking and restraining itself, the result is at any rate not a commonplace one. And no writer of the same class, not even St. Augustine or Tertullian, has told us so much about himself, and impressed the stamp of his personal character so curiously on his writings' (i. 129).

Another instance of justice in the same department may be seen in the verdict on St. Bernard, than whom there have been few characters in history more perplexing in their own lives or in the ways in which they have been regarded. At the end of a careful survey of the varying phenomena of his life, the Dean says of him :

'As the prophet and enlightener of his age, Bernard would have been greater and more complete if he had not been the preacher of the Crusade and the vanquisher of Abelard, or even the stern satirist and reformer of the corruptions and abuses of his distinguished pupil's Court at Rome. He was meant for the privacy and quiet of a life of thought, and all that such a life creates. He added to it the dazzling glory of a life of brilliant practical achievement. The pages of history have gained more from it for their varied and sad display than has the perfectness of character in him who was to bear the torch of spiritual light to his age, the last of the Fathers. He is a warning to all Christian explorers and expounders of truth—a warning all the more emphatic for the singular disinterestedness of his purpose, and the success of much which he attempted—not to be tempted, by the influence which their work in retirement has given them, into those entangling and difficult paths of public activity from which, when once a man has entered on them, it is hard to draw back, and in which it is so easy for the thinker, the divine, the teacher, to pass into the religious partisan, the religious manager and meddler and contriver, forgetting, at once in the purity and elevation of his purpose, and in the intoxication of success, the inherent snares and dangers of power in any human hands' (i. 237).

Or, we may notice the description of Cranmer as—

'the most bewildered and vacillating of public men, who knew so much, and yet too much ever to make up his mind for good—humane and considerate by nature, yet who had lent himself to some of Henry's worst acts, and could consent to the burning of an Anabaptist' (i. 398).

Passing on to the justice shown in dealing with classes of men or the significance of events, we come to an excellent

statement about the ascetics of the early Church. Here again there is great danger of opinions that become false through ignoring one side of things. The ascetics may easily be ridiculed by those who cannot transplant their minds out of the nineteenth century; they have been idealized by those who can see nothing wrong in a canonized saint. Dean Church is very far indeed from idealizing, yet he sees with clearness the real service which the ascetics rendered to Christianity:

'It is a perpetual mistake in historical judgments to insist on requiring from men what it was impossible, in the nature of things, that at the time they should be. The ascetic fervour of the early and middle centuries is wrongly judged unless, with all our dislike of it in itself, we look upon it—as indeed we can see it to have been—as a first step, not perhaps in intention yet in fact, tentative; an attempt, rude and wild, to apply to life the Gospel standard.

'When we remember what were the enormous, blind, intractable forces on the other side, in the days when it arose, of fierce, reckless, unrestrained sensuality, it seems as if nothing but such an enthusiasm, as inconsiderate and unmeasured, could balance or swing back, on a scale necessary for the progress of the world, the tremendous, ever-renewed, and accumulating pressure in favour of self-indulgence. . . . The monks and ascetics have perished, as soldiers and workers have perished; but what have they left behind? What have they done to print images, softened now by distance, of moral greatness, strength, height, unselfishness on the mind of society? What would those ages have been, being what they were, and separated by impassable intervals from the possibility of what is so commonplace to us and ready to our hand—what would they have been without this direction given to their grossness and fierce temper, without those examples of fierce self-bridling, and of proportionate discipline? So asceticism taught mankind, though by extravagance and with degeneracy and failure at the end, the hard lesson of the incomparable superiority of the higher over the lower nature. We may doubt whether the greatness of free modern morality—of which part of the greatness is that it is a thing, not of a school or of a choice aristocracy of feeling and mind, but popular, common and public—could ever have been formed and fixed without passing through the terrible agony of asceticism' (i. 223-5).

Now, it is by no means the case that there is no need at the present time of the ascetic spirit. Rather, there are many circumstances and conditions of our present life which imperatively call for the protest against selfishness and the emphasis on the pre-eminence of what is spiritual and supernatural, which asceticism is calculated to supply. But, if it is to do its work, it must differ in very many important respects from its forerunner in the early Church. Conse-

quer
the c
any
fact
meth
full c
inclu
recogn
porti
must
was t
is nee
to us
stamp
of cha
every
with
ours,
life as
thing
W
may c
'T
assum
the fin
trials
centur
the wo
of piet
words
might
the pr
bound
blessin
learnin
freed fr
will be
It may
peace.
as almo
Foxe's
themsel
preters
and Ma
Stubbs

'Ju

quently there is a possibility of the true value of the work of the early ascetics failing to meet with a just recognition from any quarter. Those who idealize the past may ignore the fact that they were in many ways faulty and that their methods cannot be the methods of our age. Those who are full of the modern spirit, and the modern spirit only, are inclined to depreciate and ridicule them. Even those who recognize a place for asceticism in our present life may, in proportion to the extent in which they realize what its methods must be, run some risk of failing to understand how great was the task which the ancient forms accomplished. What is needed is to observe how the very exaggeration, as it seems to us, of the great heroes of the past, made an indelible mark stamping on human thought the knowledge of the possibility of chastity and bearing its witness to the unimportance of everything else compared with the spiritual union of the soul with God. If we in our day, by the methods which may be ours, do as much for the Christian Church and for human life as those whom we so easily despise, it will be a good thing for us and for those whom we influence.

With Dean Church's estimate of the early ascetics we may compare a passage about the Reformation.

'Though there are still some who see nothing absurd in the assumption that opinions and decisions of the Tudor Reformers are the final law and settlement of a Church which had, after terrible trials and almost ruin, to be reorganized afresh in the following century, the time has gone by when it seemed irreverent to criticize the words and deeds of the Reformers, and when it seemed an act of piety to put a good meaning on the most questionable of their words and deeds. We feel at liberty to judge the Reformation as we might judge the French Revolution, or the system of the Papacy, or the proceedings of the Long Parliament. We do not feel ourselves bound to take it *en bloc*, as pure in its origin and unmixed in its blessings. We can venture to examine the motives, the capacity, the learning, the honesty of its chief representatives. We have been freed from a superstitious deference to it; and any school or party will be ill counselled which attempts a revival of that feeling for it. It may become an instrument of ruin. It never will be a bond of peace. It is no longer safe to view it as it was viewed at one time, as almost a second revelation. Our authorities about it are no longer Foxe's untrustworthy stories, but the letters and records of the men themselves and their contemporaries; and our guides and interpreters are no longer Burnet and Merle d'Aubigné, or even Hallam and Macaulay, but writers of the severe and judicial temper of Bishop Stubbs and Dr. Brewer' (i. 393-4).

'Judicial temper' is the very phrase we should have

chosen to describe the chief characteristic of Dean Church's own writings. A reader feels that every element of the problem, whatever it may be, has been kept in view, every argument given its due weight, the whole question impartially considered. To some minds any approach to a complete consideration of the different sides of things is paralysing. If they see the force of differing points of view, they remain powerless between them. To know the whole case is to have no clear line of thought. It was not so with Dean Church. Students of his works are familiar with the strong clear judgments which come out of his impartial thinking. They know the spectacle of the man who, having weighed all that is to be said on every side, has vigorously made up his mind. Some of the quotations we have already made are illustrative of this. It is very markedly shown in passages on such different subjects as the character of Henry VIII. and the value of much German criticism of recent date.

In one place Dean Church describes Henry VIII. as

'more like an Asiatic Sultan, or the Ottoman Mahmouds and Solimans and Selims, in his sensuality, his fanaticism, his caprice, and his cruelty, than like any other Western king' (i. 396).

In another place he writes that Wolsey

'was sacrificed and struck down at last by the almost incredible baseness and ingratitude of the King, whom twenty years of prosperity, the gain of Wolsey's steadfast loyalty, had utterly spoiled and corrupted, and turned from the high and noble prince whom all Europe had once admired, into the shameless adulterer, beginning, in Wolsey's ruin, a career, as yet unknown in England, in which the words and forms of law were used with audacious and cynical deliberation to cover some of the most monstrous cruelties recorded in English history. The divorce, with all its revolting accompaniments of craft and trickery on all sides, was the miserable end, not altogether undeserved, of Wolsey's otherwise splendid ministry. When it made its portentous appearance his downfall was rendered certain; it would have been better for his fame if he had perished earlier, in withstanding it in its very first stages. But the special form and mode which the King's brutal malice chose to give to his overthrow—the *Premunire* sued out at common law for the exercise of the Legatine authority which he had assumed and exercised by the king's wish, and by his sanction, and for his interests, and the wholesale and immediate ruin which *Premunire* brought with it—has scarcely a parallel among the worst inventions of tyranny.

'In that perfidious and violent age things were done more cruel and more bloody; but there is nothing to be found so base, so full of the sickening and hypocritical meanness of an ostentatiously bluff and outspoken nature, as Henry's treatment of his great minister.

Then
in his
histor
with
capric
389-9

A
Elms
some

'G
mode.
habit
which,
receiv
materi
theorie
always
parado
life, or
the Fr
impress
test of
But af
there h
propor
Germa
of spor
covery
the Bil
its dar
given u
self-co
book is

'M
argume
fact.
portant
world i
to its o
its fate
posed,
tions, g
loyalty
of its e
impro
days w
real thi
the dee
central

Then he seized the power which Wolsey had created for him ; and in his hands, which none controlled and none resisted, English history became a byword in Europe for reckless and insolent dealing with the most sacred interests, for all the shame of monstrous caprice, of unbridled selfishness, and of appalling bloodshed' (i. 389-91).

And in the paper entitled 'The Author of "Robert Elsmere" on a new Reformation' we read on the subject of some types of German criticism :

'German criticism, to which we are expected to defer, has its mode. It combines two elements—a diligent, searching, lawyer-like habit of cross-examination, laborious, complete, and generally honest, which, when it is not spiteful or insolent, deserves all the praise it receives ; but with it a sense of the probable, in dealing with the materials collected, and a straining after attempts to construct theories and to give a vivid reality to facts and relations, which is not always so admirable ; which lead, in fact, sometimes to the height of paradox, or show mere incapacity to deal with the truth and depth of life, or make use of a poor and mean standard—*mesquin* would be the French word—in the interpretation of actions and aims. It has impressed on us the lesson . . . that weight and not number is the test of good evidence. German learning is decidedly imposing. But after all there are Germans and Germans ; and with all that there has been of great in German work there has been also a large proportion of what is bad—conceited, arrogant, shallow, childish. German criticism has been the hunting ground of an insatiable love of sport—may we not say, without irreverence, the scene of the discovery of a good many mares' nests ? . . . Criticism has pulled about the Bible without restraint or scruple. We are all of us steeped in its daring assumptions and shrewd objections. Have its leaders yet given us an account which it is reasonable to receive, clear, intelligible, self-consistent and consistent with all the facts, of what this mysterious book is ?

'Meanwhile, in the face of theories and conjectures and negative arguments, there is something in the world which is fact, and hard fact. The Christian Church is the most potent fact in the most important ages of the world's progress. It is an institution like the world itself, which has grown up by its own strength and according to its own principle of life, full of good and evil, having as the law of its fate to be knocked about in the stern development of events, exposed, like human society, to all kinds of vicissitudes and alternations, giving occasion to many a scandal, and shaking the faith and loyalty of many a son, showing in ample measure the wear and tear of its existence, battered, injured, sometimes degenerate, sometimes improved, in one way or another, since those dim and long distant days when its course began ; but showing in all these ways what a real thing it is, never in the extremity of storms and ruin, never in the deepest degradation of its unfaithfulness, losing hold of its own central unchanging faith, and never in its worst days of decay and

corruption losing hold of the power of self-correction and hope of recovery. . . . And the Christian Church is founded on a definite historic fact, that Jesus Christ who was crucified rose from the dead ; and coming to us from such an author, it comes to us, bringing with it the Bible. . . . It may be that even yet we imperfectly understand our wondrous Bible. It may be that we have yet much to learn about it. It may be that there is much that is very difficult about it. Let us reverently and fearlessly learn all we can about it. Let us take care not to misuse it, as it has been terribly misused. But coming to us from the company and with the sanction of Christ risen, it never can be merely like other books. A so-called Christianity, ignoring or playing with Christ's resurrection, and using the Bible as a sort of Homer, may satisfy a class of clever and cultivated persons. It may be to them the parent of high and noble thoughts, and readily lend itself to the service of mankind. But it is well in so serious a matter not to confuse things. . . . A Christianity which tells us to think of Christ doing good, but to forget and put out of sight Christ risen from the dead, is not true to life. It is as delusive to the conscience and the soul as it is illogical to reason' (ii. 185-9).

There are very many other passages we would gladly quote, as a statement of deep interest when we hear a good deal, as we did a little time ago, about the possibility of the revival of the temporal power of the Papacy (i. 153-4), a very characteristic judgment on Savonarola (i. 160-1), some words of wisdom on the personal character of the Popes (i. 163-4), a paragraph on the effects produced on the mind and works of Guicciardini by growing old (i. 173-4), or the careful distinction between real narrowness and the

'inevitable appearance of narrowness and severity which must always be one side which a man of strong convictions and earnest purpose turns to those whose strong convictions and earnest purpose are opposite to his' (ii. 305-7).

But, passing by these and also, among much that is of highest interest, the excellent papers, four in number, on some of the works of Renan and the greater part of the contents of six delightful articles on Cardinal Newman, we must hasten to observe the treatment of a question which is prominent at the present time. Several of the papers are on the subject of the reunion of Christendom. Dean Church reviewed the first part of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* at great length in the *Times* in 1865 (i. 334-66). The review in the same paper in the following year on Dr. Newman's reply was also from his pen (ii. 398-440). Seven years later he wrote on Dr. Döllinger's *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches* for the *Saturday Review* (i. 367-79). There are many circumstances of the

time w
resembl
Church

'Here
Pusey] is
the Ency
While he
rules of a
itself lou
claiming
branding
the world
Dr. Pusey
language
ago ; but
fills the fi
"dogmati
of last ye
of the Ch

'Nor
the unaut
views of
speak with
vailing be

So a
mentioned

'Dr. P
answers, f
that he lo
view ; tha
peace and
—uncond

'The
Pusey, has
periods an
the foolish
myrtle" b
people of
Roman C
what Dr. l
answer to
history of
attempt to

Now, w
those day
between l
greater di

time when the first of these articles was written which resemble circumstances familiar to us now. In it Dean Church says :

'Here we have the real state of the case. While he [*i.e.* Dr. Pusey] is speculating on the possibilities of reunion, down comes the Encyclical with its train of pretensions and consequences. While he is cautiously examining the language of formularies by the rules of a learned theology, the living belief is growing and asserting itself loudly to a perpetual revelation ; and we have Dr. Faber proclaiming the "advent of the Age of Mary," and Archbishop Manning branding the English Government as "the most Anti-Christian in the world" for being neutral in the defence of the temporal power. Dr. Pusey is striving to place some reliance on the more moderate language of great French divines, like Bossuet, more than 150 years ago ; but the language of the distinguished ecclesiastic who actually fills the first place in the Roman communion in England is that the "dogmatic Bull of the Immaculate Conception, and the Encyclical of last year, will, as he believes, mark an epoch in the reconstitution of the Christian order of the world."

'Nor is there really any pretence for saying that these views are the unauthorized exaggerations of an advanced party. They are the views of the Pope himself. They are the views of all who claim to speak with authority, and to represent the legitimate and the prevailing belief' (i. 361-2).

So also, in the second article of those which we have mentioned last, it is said :

'Dr. Pusey's Appeal has received more than one answer. These answers, from the Roman Catholic side, are . . . assurances to him that he looks at the question from an entirely mistaken point of view ; that it is, of course, very right and good of him to wish for peace and union, but that there is only one way of peace and union—unconditional submission' (ii. 398).

'The Archbishop of Westminster, not deigning to name Dr. Pusey, has seized the opportunity to reiterate emphatically, in stately periods and with a polished sarcasm, his boundless contempt for the foolish people who dare to come "with swords wreathed in myrtle" between the Catholic Church and "her mission to the great people of England." On the other hand, there have been not a few Roman Catholics who have listened with interest and sympathy to what Dr. Pusey had to say, and, though obviously they had but one answer to give, have given it with a sense of the real condition and history of the Christian world, and with the respect due to a serious attempt to look evils in the face' (ii. 399-400).

Now, we do not want to exaggerate the parallel between those days and these. Obviously there are great differences between Pope Pius IX. and Pope Leo XIII., and perhaps still greater differences between Cardinal Manning and Cardinal

Vaughan. But the general features of the situation, and especially the extinguishing of hope for the time being by official words from the Pope and his chief representative in England, are strikingly alike. Now, as then, there are no signs in official quarters, whatever there may be here and there among private individuals, of the coming of that which Dean Church described as the 'first hopeful day for the reunion of Christendom,' 'the day on which the Roman Church ceases to maintain that what it holds must be truth because it holds it' (ii. 440).

Recent events have caused much discouragement to many who are unwavering in their conviction that the present claims of Rome cannot be accepted consistently with loyalty to Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Universal Church. For any who are so discouraged it may be well to think of some of the ways which Dean Church points out in which the Church of England has fulfilled a special function of peculiar difficulty. In his paper on 'Coleridge's Memoir of Keble,' published in the *Saturday Review* in 1869, he writes thus :

'In him [*i.e.* in Mr. Keble] was eminently illustrated the characteristic strength and weakness of English religion, which naturally comes out in that form of it which is called Anglicanism : that poor Anglicanism, the butt and laughing-stock of all the clever and high-flying converts to Rome, of all the clever and high-flying Liberals, and of all those poor copyists of the first, far from clever, though very high-flying, who now give themselves out as exclusive heirs of the great name of Catholic ; sneered at on all sides as narrow, meagre, shattered, barren ; which certainly does not always go to the bottom of questions, and is too much given to "hunting-up" passages for *catenas* of precedents and authorities ; but which yet has a strange, obstinate, tenacious moral force in it ; which, without being successful in formulating theories or in solving fallacies, can pierce through pretences and shams ; and which in England seems the only shape in which intense religious faith can unfold itself and connect itself with morality and duty, without seeming to wear a peculiar dress of its own, and putting a barrier of self-chosen watchwords and singularities between itself and the rest of the nation' (ii. 303-4).

He had already in 1864 written in the *Guardian* that a 'review' of the 'various turns and vicissitudes of' Dr. Newman's 'English course'

'makes us feel more than ever that the English Church, whose sturdy strength he underrated, and whose irregular theories provoked him, was fully worthy of the interest and the labours of the leader who despaired of her. Anglicanism has so far outlived its revolutions, early and late ones, has marched on in a distinct path, has developed a theology, has consolidated an organization, has formed a character

and tor
storms
and dan
which c
But the
be in st
(ii. 396-

The
which v
of a ve
to us c
is as fo

'Wit
heretics
if it will
human n
very thin
equally,
stay in ti
Person,
sentative
means of
message
be contr
it at last
in its own
enough in
A future,
to us ind

We r
made a s
Mr. New
Protestan
'the inher
tions of h
uselessnes
chievous,

He ment
'the certai
such a thin
fallibility.'

This l
other two

1 Church

and tone, has been the organ of a living spirit. The "magnetic storms" of thought which sweep over the world may be destructive and dangerous to it, as much as, but not more than, to other bodies which claim to be Churches and to represent the message of God. But there is nothing to make us think that, in the trials which may be in store, the English Church will fail while others hold their own' (ii. 396-7).

There is one other passage bearing on the same subject which we cannot forbear to quote, partly because it is itself of a very striking character, and partly also because it appears to us capable of being to a certain extent misunderstood. It is as follows:

'Without infallibility, it is said, men will turn freethinkers and heretics; but don't they, *with it*? and what is the good of the engine if it will not do its work? And if it is said that this is the fault of human nature, which resists what provokes and checks it, still that very thing, which infallibility was intended to counteract, goes on equally, whether it comes into play or not. Meanwhile, truth does stay in the world, the truth that there has been among us a Divine Person, of whom the Church throughout Christendom is the representative, memorial, and the repeater of His message; doubtless the means of knowledge are really guarded; yet we seem to receive that message as we receive the witness of moral truth; and it would not be contrary to the analogy of things here if we had often got to it at last through mistakes. But when it is reached there it is, strong in its own power; and it is difficult to think that if it is not strong enough in itself to stand, it can be protected by a claim of infallibility. A future, of which infallibility is the only hope and safeguard, seems to us indeed a prospect of the deepest gloom' (ii. 393).

We remember that in *The Oxford Movement* Dean Church made a similar reference to Infallibility. He there spoke of Mr. Newman feeling, when he wrote *Romanism and Popular Protestantism*,

'the inherent contradiction of the notion of infallibility to the conditions of human reception of teaching and knowledge, and its practical uselessness as an assurance of truth, its partly delusive, partly mischievous, working.'¹

He mentioned also

'the certain fact that in the early and undivided Church there was such a thing as authority, and there was no such thing known as Infallibility.'²

This last quotation, we think, shows the meaning of the other two. In the early Church there certainly was no such

¹ Church, *The Oxford Movement*, pp. 183-4. ² *Ibid.* pp. 184-5.

thing as Infallibility in the sense of a localized authority, able by virtue of its own specific inherited power to give infallible decisions on matters of faith and morals. The whole course of the controversies of the early Christian centuries is witness enough to that fact. But, side by side with this, it can hardly be doubted that there always was the conviction that the true and ultimate voice of the whole Christian body would, when fully and permanently made clear, represent the teaching of God. In the former sense, it could not be truly said that there is Infallibility in the Church; in the latter sense, it could not truly be denied that the Church is infallible. And, while Dean Church's statements on this point do not seem to us altogether free from ambiguity, a careful consideration and comparison of them leads us to think that his denial of Infallibility in the first sense existed together with a belief in it in the second sense. That there should be any ambiguity on a point of this kind may be compared with a certain amount of hesitancy which occasionally characterized his utterances on dogmatic questions where we should not beforehand have expected to find it: a particular type of hesitancy which was perhaps the only exception to the power we have already noticed of strong and vigorous decision after duly weighing every side. But, with regard to Infallibility, as we have stated, we think there was no hesitancy of mind, but only a particular method of expression which might mislead those who should not fully examine all that the Dean said on the subject.

The reading of these two volumes has been throughout a most enjoyable task. Our sincere thanks are due to Miss Church for the excellent selection and careful editing of the papers they contain.

ART.

1. *The*
the
De
E.
ch
2. *Som*
Te
Co

NINE m
of the l
recently
almost
was pul
the follo
has been
the New
pen of s
Dr. Salr
opens up
criticism
the theo
and is k
theories
it is no si
Hort is s
the you
down in
work, so
to-day.
strikes th
a volume
form som
time.

The
work is i
to a far g
himself.
beginning

¹ 'The
blished.'

ART. XI.—THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels.* By the late J. W. BURGON, B.D., Dean of Chichester; arranged, completed, and edited by E. MILLER, M.A., Wykehamical Prebendary of Chichester. (London, 1896.)
2. *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* By G. SALMON, D.D., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. (London, 1897.)

NINE months ago we had occasion to notice the first volume of the late Dean Burgon's literary remains,¹ which had then recently appeared under the editorship of Mr. Miller; and almost simultaneously with that article the second volume was published, of which we shall have something to say in the following pages. Since that date a further contribution has been made to the controversy on the textual criticism of the New Testament, in the shape of a small volume from the pen of so well known and universally respected a scholar as Dr. Salmon. Of neither of these works can it be said that it opens up a fresh field, or a fresh line of enquiry, in textual criticism; but both derive importance from their bearing on the theory which has held the field for the last fifteen years, and is known by the names of Westcott and Hort. Textual theories are always more or less upon their trial, and therefore it is no sign of a *parti pris* to say that the theory of Westcott and Hort is still upon its trial. It is the dominant theory among the younger generation of scholars; it is on the lines laid down in Dr. Hort's famous *Introduction* that nearly all textual work, so far as it relates to the New Testament, is being done to-day. A volume which directly impugns that theory strikes therefore at the root of contemporary progress; while a volume which criticizes it in certain details enables us to form some estimate as to how the theory has stood the test of time.

The second volume of Dean Burgon's and Mr. Miller's work is in plan a sequel to the first, though in execution it is to a far greater extent than that was from the hand of the Dean himself. Mr. Miller has contributed some sections at the beginning and end, and has occasionally supplemented the

¹ 'The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established.' See *Church Quarterly Review*, xliii. 238.

Dean's remarks in the body of the treatise; but all such additions are now indicated by the use of brackets,¹ which enable the reader to know whether he is perusing the arguments of Dean Burgon or his editor. It will be remembered that the main theme of the earlier treatise was an attempt to prove that the 'traditional text' of the Gospels, which is substantially that which is contained in the later uncial manuscripts, the great mass of the cursives, and the 'textus receptus' of our ordinary Greek Testaments and Authorized Version, has stronger claims on our acceptance than that which is supported by the two oldest extant manuscripts, with a few other uncials, a handful of cursives, and the earliest versions, and which has been preferred by most modern editors, and forms the groundwork of our Revised Version. In the volume now before us this position is assumed to have been established, and it is supported by a classification of the various ways in which the traditional text has been corrupted into those forms which we find in the 'critical texts' now in favour among biblical scholars. Some of the headings of this inventory have been fully worked out by the Dean; others were only sketched by him, and have been more or less supplemented by his editor; but between the two a considerable number of instances has been collected, in which, as they believe, the inferiority of the readings adopted by such editors as Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers, to those of the traditional text can be established and their origins explained.

The headings under which the various causes of corruption are arranged are as follows: First, those arising from accident, which include (1) mere slips of the pen, (2) homoioteleuton, where words have been omitted through lines or sentences ending with the same word or syllable, (3) mistakes due to manuscripts being written in uncials without division of words or clauses, (4) the confusion of certain vowel sounds which is known as itacism, and (5) errors caused by liturgical influence, such as the omission of passages which were not read in church, or the insertion of introductory phrases which were required when detached passages were read without their context. Secondly, there are intentional corruptions caused by (1) harmonistic influences or the altering of one passage to resemble the corresponding passage in another Gospel, (2) assimilation or the transference of phrases from

¹ Or nearly all, for various references to the Lewis Syriac MS., in passages which purport to have been written by Dean Burgon, must have been inserted by Mr. Miller.

one c
same c
of the
neighb
(6) sub
heretics

Now
there is
may be
ence, o
orthodo
or to a
form ei
doubt t
were lef
in the
unnatur
passages
them, an
into the
working
however
treatise

Furt
nothing
truth, no
substant
common
in the
Such a c
just men
devoted
applicati
the classi
correct an
may cons
'corrupti
to explain
find 'add
admitted
considera
in which

In say
Dean Bur
clear to

one evangelist to another—a slighter manifestation of the same cause of error as the last, (3) attraction or the altering of the terminations of words so as to resemble those of neighbouring words, (4) omissions, (5) transpositions of words, (6) substitutions, (7) additions, (8) glosses, (9) corruption by heretics, (10) corruption by the orthodox.

Now, it is obvious at first sight that in this classification there is a good deal of cross division. An error of omission may be due to accident, or homoioteleuton, or liturgical influence, or harmonistic influence, or corruption by heretics or orthodox. An addition may be due to most of these causes or to a gloss. Harmonistic alterations must always take the form either of omission or addition or substitution. No doubt the incomplete state in which the Dean's materials were left accounts for much that is unscientific and confusing in the arrangement of the volume. His editor has not unnaturally preferred to leave the discussions of the various passages under the headings to which the Dean had assigned them, and has not felt at liberty to recast the whole material into the logical and scientific form which either writer, if working alone, would presumably have adopted. The result, however, is that the volume consists rather of materials for a treatise than a systematic treatise itself.

Further, it will be seen that the classification in itself adds nothing to our knowledge. It contains no new touchstone of truth, no new formula for the detection of error. It contains substantially just those propositions which are either the commonplaces of textual science or are well-known features in the special department of New Testament criticism. Such a classification, apart from its unscientific arrangement just mentioned, might be adopted equally by the most devoted disciple of Dr. Hort. The difference would lie in the application, in the details assigned to the various heads of the classification. Where Dean Burgon considers one reading correct and another due to 'corruption by heretics,' Dr. Hort may consider the latter to be the original text and its rival a 'corruption by the orthodox.' Where one invokes 'omission' to explain the existence of divergent readings, the other will find 'addition.' 'Harmonistic influence' will be universally admitted to be a frequent cause of corruption, but there is considerable difference of opinion as to the specific instances in which it has been at work.

In saying this, we are making no charge against either Dean Burgon or Mr. Miller, but are merely trying to make clear to the reader what he may expect to find in

their volume. There is here no new panacea for a corrupted text, no new solution of the standing problem. It is merely the discussion, and often a very superficial discussion, of a number of isolated passages in the New Testament, where there are more or less serious divergences in the textual tradition. And these discussions are on the basis of the principles which have been formulated in the Dean's earlier volume. Those who have not been convinced by that volume of the superiority of the mass of the later uncials and the cursives over the handful of witnesses which cluster round B and κ , will find nothing here to shake them in their preference of the latter. In nine cases out of ten the Dean's proof of the superiority of the 'traditional' reading consists of nothing more than a statement of the evidence and a triumphant assertion of the immense numerical preponderance upon his side—a preponderance which his opponents do not for one moment question, but which they claim to be a preponderance in quantity only, and not in quality. The most that can be said for the Dean's work is that in a certain number of instances it may make it desirable that the judgment of Westcott and Hort should be reconsidered; not on the ground that their principles are unsound, but that the application of them in particular cases is questionable.¹

The general issue, then, as to the soundness or unsoundness of the theory propounded by Westcott and Hort remains unaffected by the volume before us, which does not aim at reinforcing its predecessor, but at applying its conclusions to a number of individual cases. Its publication, moreover, followed too soon on that of the first volume to admit of Mr. Miller noticing more than a few of the earlier criticisms which that volume elicited. There is nothing in it which requires us to reconsider the opinion already expressed in our previous article as to the general attitude of Dean Burgon and Mr. Miller on textual questions; and the present is hardly a suitable occasion for the discussion of particular details.

While, however, there does not appear to be any necessity to consider anew the conclusion to which we previously came as to the *general* truth of Dr. Hort's theory, it does not follow that we are bound to accept that theory in all its details and without question or criticism. Indeed a preference

¹ For instance, in Matt. xxii. 23, where WH. (and R. V.) read λέγοντες for οἱ λέγοντες of the T.R. Since the preceding word is Σαδδουκαῖοι, the loss of οἱ is so easily explicable that it seems unnecessary to suppose that St. Matthew here said anything different from St. Mark and St. Luke, who have respectively οἱ τῶν λέγοντων and οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες. See Burgon, p. 49.

for some
which
accepted
one or
class wh
by Dr.
Dean B
College
Referrin
ship he
scholars

'Mos
cause; a
verse.'¹

And ag

'I th
not requ
accept I
investiga
predeter
learning
than his
in the pr
ing about

It is
and esp
primari
cerned;
consider
is useful
and pub
as Dr.
teacher
and exa
the bes
research
able, it
develop
Dr.
adopted
first to
by man
Hort to

¹ TH
VOL.

for some qualifications of it was indicated in the article to which we have referred; and not a few writers who have accepted Dr. Hort's main conclusions have dissented from one or other of his subordinate dicta. It is criticism of this class which is contained in the little volume recently issued by Dr. Salmon. With regard to the broad issue between Dean Burgon and Dr. Hort, the learned Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, is unhesitatingly on the side of the latter. Referring to the volumes published under Mr. Miller's editorship he says, in words which will express the feelings of most scholars:

'Most readers will feel that they are asked to try again a ruled cause; and the general verdict is one which I have no desire to reverse.'¹

And again:

'I think that the majority of any readers I am likely to have will not require me to state at length my reasons for being unable to accept Burgon's principles, and for feeling no confidence in an investigation conducted with such manifest resolve to bring out a predetermined result. And though some of the points which Burgon's learning and ingenuity have raised perhaps deserve more discussion than his adversaries have been inclined to give them, I feel that in the present state of the controversy there is more profit in speaking about Westcott and Hort's work than about Burgon's.'²

It is, accordingly, with the work of Westcott and Hort, and especially with the *Introduction*, for which Dr. Hort was primarily answerable, that Dr. Salmon's criticisms are concerned; and they raise several points which are well worth considering. They are not, it is true, all entirely new; but it is useful to have them brought together in a formal manner, and published under the authority of so competent a scholar as Dr. Salmon. To make a fetish of any theory or any teacher is fatal to science; and it is in the free criticism and examination of the Westcott and Hort hypothesis that the best hope of progress lies in the domain of textual research. Even if the foundations of it prove to be unassailable, it may well be that the superstructure is capable of development and improvement.

Dr. Salmon's first criticism relates to the nomenclature adopted in Hort's *Introduction*; and here, as he is not the first to raise the objection, so it will be found to be shared by many other scholars. None of the terms employed by Hort to designate the various families into which he divides

¹ *Thoughts on Textual Criticism*, p. 2.
VOL. XLIV.—NO. LXXXVIII.

² *Ibid.* p. 5.
G G

the textual authorities is free from difficulty. 'Syrian,' besides its inconvenient resemblance to 'Syriac,' localizes unduly and not quite accurately a form of text, which, it is generally agreed, was of universal acceptance after the fourth century. 'Western' is still more misleading, since this type of text is also found in several Syriac authorities, and almost certainly had its origin in the East and not in the West. On the other hand, Mr. Miller's description of it as 'Syro-Low-Latin' is too cumbrous for ordinary use. 'Alexandrian' has always been felt to be a rather vague description, the readings so classified being difficult either to define or to identify. Indeed there is much force in Dr. Salmon's argument that the attestation of Hort's 'Neutral' readings is very largely Alexandrian, and that the readings which he denominates as 'Alexandrian' are 'those readings which are Alexandrian in their origin and are not recognized by Codex B.'¹ Finally, Dr. Salmon objects to the term 'Neutral' as question-begging, and proposes to substitute 'early Alexandrian' for it, as sufficiently denoting the ascertained character of that class of text, without begging the question as to whether the text current in Alexandria in the second or third century was or was not a very close approximation to that of the autographs of the New Testament Scriptures.

On this point of nomenclature it is easier to assent to Dr. Salmon's criticisms than to devise any satisfactory alternatives; and it may further be felt that the point is not one of fundamental importance. When a terminology such as this is new, the several descriptions no doubt carry with them some external associations, and tend to characterize, as well as merely to label, the several classes of text; but the more they are used, the more they become mere labels, and the less are they felt as descriptions of character. It may be doubted whether the textual student is now either misled or embarrassed by the use of this terminology. He is quite aware that the term 'Syrian' denotes the text generally current since the fourth century, and that 'Western' texts are not confined to Western lands and languages. The terms have become tickets, and have ceased to mislead, if ever they have done so.

There is more substance and importance in Dr. Salmon's argument as to the Alexandrian character of Hort's 'Neutral' text; and his conclusion may be best set forth in his own words:

¹ *Thoughts on Textual Criticism*, p. 51.

'
have
they
graphs
—prob
second

On
of the
it may
elsew
Roma
that i
Alexa
It mu
little
Salmo
althou
found
does n
comm
Syriac
in Eu
shown
(since
strong
occupy
at Ro
Furthe
had a
schola
fact t
Alexa
that t
literary
school
Rome,
as a li

The
looking
tradition
consequ
appear
Dr. Sa
regard

'I do not think I underrate the immense service which WH. have rendered to Biblical criticism, if I express my opinion that what they have restored is not the text of the original evangelic autographs, but the text of a MS. which came very early to Alexandria—probably in the third century and possibly before the end of the second.'¹

Of course this conclusion still leaves unsolved the problem of the character of this supposed archetypal manuscript; but it may be taken in connexion with the suggestion thrown out elsewhere by Dr. Salmon, that the Alexandrian and the Roman textual traditions were different from the first, and that it is unnatural to suppose that, where they differed, the Alexandrian school was always right and the Roman wrong. It must be remembered, however, that we have comparatively little evidence as to the nature of the Roman tradition. Dr. Salmon seems to identify it with the 'Western' text; but although one of the main homes of the Western text is to be found in the Old Latin version, it is also true that this version does not seem to have had its origin in Rome, and that the common ancestor of the Old Latin and Old (or Curetonian) Syriac must apparently be sought rather in Asia than in Europe. We have no early manuscripts which can be shown, or are even suspected, to have been written at Rome (since the evidence which connects B with Cæsarea is too strong to be resisted), and we have no Roman Fathers who occupy at all the position with regard to the textual tradition at Rome that Origen holds with regard to Alexandria. Further, there seems to be reason to believe that Christianity had a far greater command of literary resources and textual scholarship at Alexandria than at Rome. Apart from the fact that for Greek literature generally the authority of Alexandria would stand higher than that of Rome, it is clear that the Christian Scriptures had a better chance of arousing literary interest and attention in Alexandria, with its active school of Jewish religious thought and literature, than at Rome, to which Christianity came as a faith and a life, not as a literature or a philosophy.

There would therefore seem to be substantial grounds for looking to Alexandria as the place in which a good textual tradition would be most likely to be preserved, and for giving, consequently, a general preference to the authorities which appear to embody that tradition. But they do not deprive Dr. Salmon's suggestion of all weight; on the contrary, we regard that suggestion as embodying the real problem with

¹ *Thoughts on Textual Criticism*, p. 52.

which textual critics are now confronted. This is, in the fewest possible words, what is the weight to be attached to Western readings? It is in the Western text that the centre of interest is, at the present time, to be found. It is a problem of great complexity, and at the same time of great interest. There is a type of text characterised by the extent and boldness of its departures from all other types. It is found in several forms—in the Greek text of D, in the old Latin manuscripts (and with many variations among themselves), in the Curetonian Syriac, in the Lewis Syriac (so near akin to and yet so different from the Curetonian), in various Syriac Fathers, in Tatian's Diatessaron, and, to some extent, in the Armenian version. Further, it is plainly of very early origin, traceable back to the second, possibly even to the first, century. What, then, is to be said of this text, and what weight is to be attached to its evidence? Or, as preliminary questions, on the answers to which our conclusions on the main issue must depend, where and how did this type of text come into existence?

It is manifestly impossible to examine such a problem exhaustively within the limits of a Review article; and indeed the problem is one which cannot yet be fully solved. Much research is still needed before an answer can be given; and it is satisfactory to know that it is engaging the attention of several scholars, who show their respect for Dr. Hort's teaching by carrying out the investigations for which he laid down the lines. Something may be learnt from a consideration of the conditions under which copies of the Scriptures circulated during the first ages of the Church, when systematic copying by trained scribes can have been possible only in a few centres, such as Alexandria or Ephesus, while elsewhere private copies, written (like many of the Greek papyri recently discovered in Egypt) in non-literary style, passed from hand to hand, and from church to church, among the less cultivated communities of Syria and Asia Minor. In copies such as these, unauthorized additions are very intelligible, and still more so are the transpositions and interchangings of words which characterize Western manuscripts. If it is difficult to understand how *αἰνοῦντες* came to be substituted for *εὐλογοῦντες* in St. Luke xxiv. 53,¹ is it not equally difficult to understand how *ἀνδραποδώδη* came to be substituted for *εὐήθη* (or *vice versa*) in the *Phædo* of Plato (68 E), or

¹ Salmon, p. 70; Mr. Miller, in his essay on 'Conflation' (p. 278), misses this point, and simply asserts his preference for the traditional reading, *αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες*.

ἐν πα
in an
A
name
ceedi
eluci
hypo
sugg
Bisho
broug
Blasse
that
the e
readi
he th
regan
publi
wher
easily
the w
litera
as co
litera
know
Lord
disca
the s
tradi
gloss
to de
from
autho
T
varia
work
chara
probl
two o
shoul
origi
that l
or rat
have
revisi

ἐν παρρησίᾳ ζῶντες for ὄντες Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ παιδείας μετέχοντες in an epistle of Demosthenes (Ep. III. 13)?

Another explanation is put forward by Dr. Salmon, namely the possible existence of more than one version proceeding from the original author, or of oral additions or elucidations by the author to the original narrative. The hypothesis of a second edition from the author's own pen was suggested, in the case of the two books of St. Luke, by Bishop Lightfoot, and has recently been elaborated and brought formally within the range of criticism by Professor Blass. Dr. Salmon extends this hypothesis by the suggestion that St. Luke 'may have continued to reside at Rome after the expiration of Paul's two years, and may there have given readings of his work; and that explanatory statements which he then made were preserved in the West.'¹ Similarly with regard to the other books of the New Testament, 'the first publication of the Gospel story was oral and official;' and where the story was told *viva voce* , verbal alterations may easily have been introduced, and so have found their way into the written copies. No doubt, if the problem were merely a literary one, this would tend to discredit the Roman evidence as compared with the Alexandrian, where the traditions of literary scholarship were more scientific; but if we wish to know what the apostles and evangelists recorded of our Lord's life and teaching upon earth, we cannot altogether discard the additions and glosses of the Western text. At the same time it may be right to adopt the stricter literary tradition as our standard, and to relegate such additions and glosses to a lower place; especially as it is quite impossible to determine whether, in each individual case, they proceed from an apostle or evangelist, or from some teacher of less authority.

These speculations concerning the origin of the Western variations appear to us the most important part of Dr. Salmon's work, because, as we have said before, the explanation of the character and origin of the Western text is now the special problem to be investigated by textual critics. There remain two other topics in this suggestive little book to which we should like to call attention. The first of these relates to the origin of the 'Syrian' or 'traditional' text. It is well known that Hort referred it to a deliberate revision at a definite time, or rather at two definite times, since he held that there must have been an earlier and a later revision, the corresponding revision of the Syriac text, to which he referred the origin of

¹ Salmon, p. 140.

the Peshitto, having taken place between the two. It has from the first been felt to be a difficulty in the way of this hypothesis that no reference has survived in Christian literature to either of these revisions. We know the names of revisers of the Septuagint and of the Latin versions ; but we have no mention of the more important undertaking with regard to the Greek New Testament. Hence it has been held more probable that the process of revision was gradual and informal, the result of a school of criticism with a general tendency in one direction rather than of a formal revision by one or more definitely appointed revisers. Dr. Salmon's explanation comes to much the same as this. In each Church, on his view, the bishop had complete authority over the text of the Scriptures read in that Church ; and verbal alterations, especially if, as is the case with the 'Syrian revision,' they tended in the direction of clearness and fullness, would be likely to be accepted by the congregation without remark. Hence, in a great see like that of Antioch, a bishop with a turn for textual criticism, such as Origen or Eusebius would have been, or such as our own Archbishop Parker, might go far in the way of introducing a 'Revised Version' of the Scriptures. As Dr. Salmon points out, we have a proved instance of the introduction of such changes, on an even larger scale, in the substitution of the version of Theodotion for that of the Seventy in the Book of Daniel as read in the churches, though we know neither when nor how this change was brought about. This hypothesis stands halfway between the formal and official revision supposed by Hort and the silent and multitudinous process of change which has been preferred by others ; but it is manifest that it fits in easily with the latter view, being in fact only an intensified expression of the tendency therein supposed.

The remaining subject to which we desire to call attention is the bearing of the synoptic problem on textual questions in the first three Gospels. In Westcott and Hort this is only taken into consideration so far as it explains certain corruptions due to what Dean Burgon calls harmonistic influences. If one Gospel contains a certain phrase, while in the corresponding place in another Gospel the authorities are divided between that phrase and a different one, it is held that there is an *a priori* probability that the latter reading is correct, and that it has been altered in some manuscripts so as to correspond with the version in the other Gospel. But, as Dr. Salmon points out, the justice of this argument depends on the view we take as to the origin of the common matter in

the Syn-
pender
would
drawin
diverge
tion th
variatio
very ea
On thi
the Sy
person
most p
district
diverge
circulat
textual
thesis,
reading
are in
rightly
hardly
identica
that the
date an

The
seem to
now ge
merely
then, w
of a pas
(1) wha
common
authorit
gelist h
may be
that it s

We
in Dr. S
said to s
lies in i
than the
taken no
forth, ter
intellect
claim to

the Synoptists. If the three Evangelists were wholly independent authors, then, no doubt, complete identity of phrase would arouse suspicion ; but if, on the other hand, they were drawing from a common source, identity is natural, and divergence is a ground for suspecting corruption. The question then arises, How are we to account for the existence of variations in some authorities, which, moreover, are generally very early authorities, such as B & D and their associates ? On this Dr. Salmon's suggestion is that in the earliest times the Synoptic Gospels probably circulated separately. Few persons and few churches would possess all three, and for the most part each would be attached, so to speak, to a different district. Hence it is quite possible, and even natural, that divergences would be introduced during this period of separate circulation, which lies behind the earliest date to which our textual evidence can be supposed to carry us. On this hypothesis, although B and its associates preserve for us very early readings in the class of passages under consideration, they are in fact very early errors, which the 'Syrian revisers' rightly expelled from the text edited by them. This, it need hardly be remarked, is a point of view which is practically identical with that of Dean Burgon and Mr. Miller, except that they appear to assign the 'corruptions' of B to a later date and to semi-Arian influences.

The conclusion to which Dr. Salmon's argument would seem to lead will be, then, to the following effect. If, as is now generally held, there is a common document (and not merely oral tradition) underlying the three Synoptic Gospels, then, wherever the Evangelists differ in their representation of a passage derived from that document, we have to consider (1) what, on their joint evidence, was the form of words in the common original ? (2) Is the variation which we find in our authorities more likely to have been introduced by the Evangelist himself or by a later copyist ? The second question may be differently answered in different cases ; but it is right that it should be clearly put and fairly considered.

We do not profess to have exhausted the topics included in Dr. Salmon's book ; but we hope that enough has been said to show its character and its interest. Its special value lies in its suggestiveness. While claiming to be no more than the tentative suggestions of a Biblical student who has taken no special part in textual research, it does in fact set forth, temperately and sensibly, the acute criticisms of a trained intellect ; and it will have a greater effect because it does not claim too much. Dr. Salmon fully recognizes a fact which

the avowed antagonists of Westcott and Hort often forget, that Hort's *Introduction* is nothing more than a summary of conclusions, with brief extracts of the evidence on which they were founded. In this respect it corresponds closely with Darwin's *Origin of Species*, and, like it, has consequently been charged with arriving at conclusions on insufficient evidence. Hort, like Darwin, devoted immense pains to the accumulation of minute particulars, and no critic or opponent can do him justice who does not recognize, not only in word but in practice, that, whether his conclusions be right or wrong, they were neither rashly formed nor hastily put forward. To assail his theory as a whole requires, in the first place, a detailed and *sympathetic* study of it; and that is what Dean Burgon was constitutionally incapable of giving to it. A display of prejudice, the suspicion that an opponent's arguments are not fairly treated, inevitably deprives a criticism of half its effect.¹ If Hort's theory is to be shaken, it is far more likely to be brought about by criticisms in the manner of Dr. Salmon, which, while showing the fullest respect to Hort's care, learning, and diligence, and recognizing that his evidence has not yet been fully placed before the world, yet suggest considerations which may, if followed up, go far towards modifying some of his extreme conclusions.

It has been announced that a selection of the papers left behind him by Dr. Hort is being prepared for publication, and it may be that some of the criticisms, whether of Dr. Salmon or Dean Burgon or Mr. Miller, will there be found to be fully answered. It would not be wise, however, to base great expectations on this announcement. As the case of Dean Burgon shows, it is very difficult to build up the scattered papers of a dead scholar into a satisfactory representation of his views. The very respect which the editor feels for his author must deter him from handling the material with the freedom which the author himself would have used. Much, too, may have been in the master's mind which was not in his

¹ An instance of this may be seen in Mr. Miller's appendix on 'Conflation,' where he begins an examination of the eight examples offered by Hort in his *Introduction* by asking the reader to 'remark that eight is a round [!] and divisible number. Did the author decide upon it with a view of presenting two specimens from each Gospel?' He then proceeds to suggest that, as the examples are all taken from St. Mark and St. Luke, Hort evidently failed to find suitable examples in the other Evangelists. This is merely setting up a dummy in order to knock it down again, and prepares the reader unfavourably for the consideration of the rest of a paper on a very proper and legitimate subject of criticism. We only call attention to this point because we think that Mr. Miller, quite unconsciously, does himself an injustice by methods such as these.

note-D
is very
as gat
origina
tions f
editors
the los
obtain
and in
which
good,
place
in an a
not fai

ART.

1. *His*
P
(*H*)
2. *The*
B
by

THE fi
history
in Eng
much
It will
be quit
the au
archae
the mo
des Pe
far wid
of Egy
the ear
a stupe
and on
for, be
work,
eviden

note-books, and which the pupil cannot fully supply ; and it is very seldom that one man can state another man's views, as gathered from his scattered papers, as effectively as the original author could have done himself. These considerations forbid us to hope that the work, even of the competent editors whom Cambridge can provide, will fully make good the loss of Dr. Hort himself. The best results will rather be obtained by working on the lines which Dr. Hort laid down, and in the spirit of fearless and independent research, of which he set so striking an example. If his foundations were good, they will bear the superstructure which his disciples place upon it ; but if they are unsound, we may be sure that, in an age of eager criticism like the present, its weakness will not fail to be discovered, and that speedily.

ART. XII.—MASPERO'S 'MÊLÉES DES PEUPLES'
AND THE S.P.C.K.

1. *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient Classique—Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples.* Par G. MASPERO. (Paris, 1897.)
2. *The Struggle of the Nations—Egypt, Syria, and Assyria.* By G. MASPERO. Edited by A. H. SAYCE. Translated by M. L. MACLURE. (London, 1896.)

THE first volume of Professor Maspero's great work on the history of the early Eastern nations was so warmly received in England on its appearance in 1894 that it is not too much to say that the second was even eagerly looked for. It will not disappoint its readers, though to many it cannot be quite so interesting as *Les Origines*. In this latter volume the author had confined himself chiefly to the history and archæology of Egypt and Chaldæa, and dealt with them in the most able and masterly manner. The *Premières Mêlées des Peuples* naturally, as its title shows, has for its scope a far wider field, and needs must embrace not only the histories of Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria, but those of the Israelites, the early Canaanitish tribes, and the Phœnicians, &c. It is a stupendous task that Professor Maspero has set himself, and one which few but he would have dared to undertake ; for, besides the vast stores of learning necessary for such a work, it requires untold patience to search out and sift evidences, a clear brain to arrange them in order when found,

a complete grasp of this wide subject, and an immense capacity for being able 'to do drudgery' in the shape of details. That the learned author is possessed of all these qualifications we have abundant evidence throughout the book. His statements, when not made from his own personal knowledge, are generally supported and verified by references to the writings of the best authorities. This is invaluable to the student; but, on looking carefully through the footnotes, it is difficult to determine what is his principle of selection. Some of the references are to works now a little out of date, and some authors are even conspicuous by their absence.

In substance *Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples* is historical and critical rather than archæological, although in Chapter V. we have a most lucid and fascinating account of some of the celebrated Egyptian temples, with critical remarks upon their decoration, an account of Egyptian society and art under the Ramessides, and a very charming selection from their love-songs, maxims, and moral dialogues.

Professor Maspero brings down *Les Origines* to Dynasty XIV. of the Egyptian Empire, a date for which he does not even suggest; for the student or for those well up in Egyptian history this, perhaps, does not signify much, but to the general reader the '14th Dynasty' would probably only produce a vague and unsatisfactory sensation. Professor Petrie, who has devoted much time and care to the question of Egyptian dates, places the XIV. Dynasty about B.C. 2112-1928.¹ By this time there was a general feeling of stir and unrest among the peoples, notably among the tribes in Syria and Chaldæa; a desire for the acquisition of territory and power was manifesting itself strongly, and some of the foreigners were already endeavouring to force their way into the fertile lands of the Delta. The scenes which year after year appear to have taken place in the plains or among the mountains of Syria remind one forcibly of what has for long gone on among the peoples of the Balkan States.

Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples opens with a vivid description of the country lying between the Orontes on the north and El Arish on the south, and, as Maspero truly points out, from the very conformation of the land it never could—unless under the sway of some dominant power—be other than a perpetual battle-ground.

'Sa position fait d'elle en effet comme un carrefour, où la plupart

¹ *History of Egypt*, by Petrie, p. 227.

des rac
et par
elle off
en Asie
rives de
Egypte
l'objet
fatalité
compos
d'oppos
l'ossatu
bassins
les uns

And
feature
graphs
it alrea
WH

our era
and th
to answ
the exi
and pla
Babyl
a Sem
speakin
wander
Mount
Semite
(circ.
eye-pa
Hasan
leader,
clearly
little l
desert
tolerat
The wi
drough
prevale
nomad
country

¹ Pet
specified
² Ar
Plates x

des races militaires de l'ancien monde finirent par arriver tôt ou tard et par de choquer violemment. Resserrée entre la mer et le désert, elle offre la seule route de trajet facile qui mène les armées d'Afrique en Asie, et tous les conquérants que les richesses accumulées aux rives de l'Euphrate ou du Nil ont attirés en Mésopotamie ou en Egypte, ont dû lui passer brutalement sur le corps, avant d'atteindre l'objet de leurs convoitises. Elle aurait échappé peut-être à cette fatalité du site, si le relief et l'agencement des terres dont elle se compose lui avaient permis de grouper ses nations en faisceau, et d'opposer leur masse compacte au flux des envahisseurs, mais l'ossature des montagnes sur laquelle elle s'appuie la morcelle en bassins isolés, où ses habitants s'enferment et végètent dans l'hostilité les uns des autres' (p. 4).

An admirable description is given of the physical features of Syria, and the illustrations made from photographs taken in the country render it even more lucid than it already is.

Who peopled this wild land in the third millennium before our era, and what relics have they left us to tell of themselves and their history? These are questions well-nigh impossible to answer with anything like accuracy. Excavations prove the existence of peoples who were at any rate partly civilised, and place-names that have found their way into Egyptian, Babylonian, and Hebrew writings betray in many cases a Semitic origin. Maspero is of opinion that, roughly speaking, the northern part was peopled by tribes who had wandered into the country from beyond the Taurus Mountains, while the centre and south were colonised by Semites. The foreign visitors who in the XII. Dynasty (*circ.* B.C. 2778-2565)¹ brought their offering of *mest'em*, or eye-paint, to the great feudal lord, Khnem-hetep, at Beni Hasan, have distinctly the Asiatic type of face, and their leader, Absha, has a Semitic name.² This expedition was clearly a pacific and possibly a commercial one; but we find a little later on the Pharaohs alluding to the 'princes of the desert' with ire, and when their insolence could no longer be tolerated, expeditions were sent from Egypt against them. The wild Syrian country, alternately subject to storms and droughts, was one in which we know scarcity was often prevalent, and what could be more tempting to the wild nomadic tribes of the south than a raid down into the fertile country of the Delta? On the northern side the people

¹ Petrie's dates are given throughout, except when otherwise specified.

² *Archæological Survey of Egypt—Beni Hasan*, Part I., p. 69, Plates xxviii., xxx., xxxi.

appear to have had dealings with the Babylonians, who received materials from the Amanos; possibly even some of their cedarwood from Lebanon. In reconstructing Babylonian history we feel that Maspero is not on his own ground, and we wish that he could have seen his way to associate with himself for this portion of his book one of his learned Assyriological colleagues. Some of the finest scholars on that subject are to be found in Paris. The statements concerning the kings mentioned between pp. 29-39 are by some considered open to question, and attention was drawn to that fact in the *Athenæum* of April 24, p. 535. The learned writer therein calls attention to the fact that Maspero has quietly adopted a view of Professor Sayce's which demonstrably cannot be maintained. Apparently Sayce and Schrader have, without themselves examining a certain Babylonian tablet, given it as their opinion that the identification of a name (broken) with that of Eri-aku or Rimsin, made by Pinches, is correct; while

'The greatest living authority on Babylonian tablets holds the opinion that the two fragments formed part of tablets of an astrological nature wherein matters of various kinds were mentioned, from the price of garden stuff upwards; in any case they have no historical value, for they belong to so late a period that they might well have been written by scribes who were conversant with the Hebrew narrative of Genesis as possessed by the Jews in Babylon about B.C. 300.'

This much is, however, quite certain, that Kudur-lagamar (Chedorlaomer) and his allies sallied forth to quell the rebellion of the cities by the Dead Sea, and were victorious. This is the beginning of the struggle to found an Elamite dynasty.

From the battle of the four kings with five, Maspero turns directly to discuss that much-vexed question of the Hyksôs invasion. That about B.C. 2098 a wild horde of invaders from Asia poured down into the Delta and there settled themselves is undoubted, but who they actually were is still more or less wrapped in mystery. Lepsius and Maspero think the Hyksôs were Canaanites; Meyer and Steindorff, that they were of Phœnician origin; Winckler, that they were Elamites; and Mariette came round to the view that they were of Mongol origin. Professor Flower, in England, and Dr. Virchow, in Germany, relying upon the statement made by certain eminent archaeologists that the heads found at Damanhûr, and the curious figures of the fish-carriers now in the Gizeh Museum, and also the granite head now in the British Museum,

were P
'In spi
remain
myster
another
directly
After
shown
on to s

'Th
epoch i
mean th
which s
trary to
remain
in the m
to a dec
have be
and eve
class, to
We need
ruling o
they hav
Bagdad,
have le
where th
up of ra
invasion
which it
tions co
races an
a direct
the opin
the Hyk
quest of
of the E

The
so says
cruelty
'the br
soon lo

'Unc
ments d
d'eux, av

were Hyksôs, have pronounced the type to be Mongolian. 'In spite of the facts we possess, the problem therefore still remains unsolved and the origin of the Hyksôs is still as mysterious as ever' (p. 56). Professor Naville offers yet another suggestion as to the origin of the invaders and directly couples their incursions with the Elamite rising.¹ After pointing out the strongly Turanian type of face as shown particularly by the heads found at Bubastis, he goes on to say that—

'The presence of a Turanian race in Mesopotamia at a remote epoch is no more questioned by most Assyriologists. It does not mean that the whole bulk of the invaders, the entire population which settled in Egypt, were of Turanian origin. It would be contrary to well-established historical facts. It is certain that all that remained in Egypt of the Hyksôs, in the language, in the worship, in the name of *Aamu*, by which they were called, everything points to a decidedly Semitic influence. But the kings may very well not have been Semites. How often do we see in Eastern monarchies and even in European states a difference of origin between the ruling class, to which the royal family belongs, and the mass of the people? We need not leave Western Asia and Egypt; we find there Turks ruling over nations to the race of which they do not belong, although they have adopted their religion. In the same way as the Turks of Bagdad, who are Finns, now reign over Semites, Turanian kings may have led into Egypt and governed a population of mixed origin where the Semitic element was prevalent. If we consider the mixing up of races which took place in Mesopotamia in remote ages, the invasions which the country had to suffer, the repeated conflicts of which it was the theatre, there is nothing extraordinary that populations coming out of this land should have presented a variety of races and origins. Therefore I believe that, though we cannot derive a direct evidence from ethnological considerations, they do not oppose the opinion stated above, that the starting point of the invasion of the Hyksôs must be looked for in Mesopotamia, and that the conquest of Egypt by the Shepherds was the consequence of the inroads of the Elamites into the valley of the Tigris and Euphrates.'²

The arrival of these hordes in the Delta was ushered in—so says Manetho, writing in the days of the Ptolemies—with cruelty and excesses of all kinds;³ but as Maspero points out, 'the brutalities attending the invasion once past, the invaders soon lost their barbarity and became rapidly civilised' (p. 57).

'Une fois entrés à l'école, ils s'initient sans effort aux raffinements de la vie civilisée. La cour des Pharaons se reforma autour d'eux, avec sa pompe et son cortège accoutumé de fonctionnaires

¹ *Bubastis*, p. 18.

² *Ibid.* p. 28, by Ed. Naville.

³ Müller-Didot, *Frag. Hist. Grec.*, vol. ii., p. 566.

grands et petits : le protocole des Amenemhait et des Ousirtasen, adapté à ces *Princes des terres étrangères*, fit d'eux les descendants d'Horus et les fils légitimes du Soleil. Ils respectèrent les religions locales, ils favorisèrent même ceux des dieux dont les attributs leur parurent s'approcher le plus à ceux de leur divinités barbares. Le plus haut des êtres qu'ils adoraient, le Baal, le seigneur de tous, était un soldat violent et farouche ; il ressemblait si fort au Sit ennemi et frère d'Osiris, qu'on le confondit avec celui-ci, mais en ajoutant au nom une terminaison emphatique, Southkou, le grand Sit' (p. 58).

Petrie suggests that the Hyksôs 'became more civilized probably by the culture inherited from the Egyptian mothers of the second and third generation.'¹

It was towards the close of the Hyksôs occupation that the Beni Israel, or Sons of Israel, seem to have made their way into Egypt. Tradition says it was during the reign of Apepi, one of the last of the foreign kings. We could have wished that Professor Maspero had entered more fully into the details of Joseph's life at the court of Pharaoh and into the Israelite history generally during the period of the 430 years' sojourn in Egypt. He sums it up very tersely and graphically thus :—

'Le pays de Goshen s'intercalait entre Héliopolis au sud, Bubastis à l'ouest, Tanis et Mendès au nord ; les troupes enfermées dans Avaris pouvaient le surveiller aisément et y maintenir l'ordre, tout en défendant contre les incursions des Monâtiou et des Hirou-Shâitou. Les Bné-Israel prospérèrent dans ces parages si bien adaptés à leur goûts traditionnels : s'ils n'y devinrent pas le grand peuple qu'on imagina par la suite, ils n'y subirent pas le sort de tant de tribus étrangères, qui, transplantées en Egypte, s'y étioient et s'éteignent, ou se fondent dans la masse des indigènes au bout de deux ou trois générations. Ils continuèrent leur métier de bergers, presque en vue des riches cités du Nil, et ils n'abandonnèrent point le dieu de leurs pères pour se prosterner devant les triades ou les Ennéades des Egyptiens ; qu'il s'appelât déjà Jahvéh ou qu'il se contentât du nom collectif d'Elohim, ils l'adorèrent sans trop d'infidélités en face de Râ et d'Osiris, de Phtah et de Soutkou' (p. 72).

It is from the Sallier Papyrus that we read of the struggle which took place between the Hyksôs and the native Egyptians, and which finally resulted in the ejection of the former into Syria. It appears that the whole land lay in the power of the 'Fever-stricken,' but that there was no supreme ruler. At Thebes dwelt Seqenen Ra, a native *haq* or prince, and Apepi was the foreign magnate in the northern city of Avaris. Now Apepi paid homage to the god Sutekh, and

¹ Petrie, *History of Egypt*, vol. i., p. 236.

raised
offered
bethou
to incl
that eff
that a
of host
the fin
them
pushed
the Bra
prince
Profess
wounds
mother
extend
Queen
portrait
Wieder
an Eth
that sh
dark h
among
Neferta
she may
followe
had be
themsel
among
nation
address
Elepha

'Thi
has arise
the livin
follows :
the Vult
the gold
hearts, I
Thothme
to the g
chanted
for ever

raised a temple in his honour outside the palace gates, and offered sacrifices and garlands of flowers daily. He then bethought him that the people of Thebes should be made to include his god in their cultus, and sent word to them to that effect. This Seqenen Ra declined to do. Maspero thinks that a century and a half elapsed between the commencement of hostilities consequent upon Apepi's imperious message and the final defeat of the Hyksôs, when Thothmes I. forced them back into Syria. They were, however, first of all pushed back into the Delta, where Seqenen Ra III., surnamed the Brave, died fighting. The learned author thinks that the prince may have been the victim of some plot (p. 79), but Professor Petrie believes him to have received his death wounds on the battlefield.¹ His wife, Aah-hetep, was the mother of the celebrated black queen, Nefertari, whose worship extended through many generations. The nationality of Queen Nefertari has often been called in question, as her portraits represent her either with a blue or black face, and Wiedemann² has suggested that she was the daughter of an Ethiopian king. Maspero, however, strenuously maintains that she was of pure Egyptian race, and explains that the dark hue given her was on account of her being admitted among the funerary goddesses (p. 99). Petrie believes that Nefertari's father was of Berber extraction, and that therefore she may have been 'three-quarters black.'³ Unsettled times followed the death of Seqenen Ra, until finally the 'Plague' had been ousted, and a race of kings arose who devoted themselves to the aggrandisement of their country. First among these was Thothmes I., whose very interesting coronation letter is preserved to us: the following copy was addressed, as will be seen by the contents, to the governor of Elephantiné. It runs thus:—

'This is the royal rescript to announce to you that my Majesty has arisen King of the double Egypt, upon the seat of the Horus of the living—without equal, living for ever, and my titles are as follows:—The vigorous bull Horus, the beloved of Maât, the lord of the Vulture, and Uraeus, who raises itself as a flame most valiant—the golden Horus whose years are good and who puts life into all hearts, king of the two Egypts, Aa-kheper-ka-Ra, son of the sun, Thothmes, living for ever. Cause, therefore, sacrifices to be offered to the gods of the south and of Elephantiné, and hymns to be chanted for the well being of the King Aa-kheper-ka-Ra, living for ever, and cause the oath to be taken in the name of my

¹ Petrie, *History of Egypt*, p. 8.

² Wiedemann, *Aegypt. Gesch.* p. 309.

³ Petrie, *History of Egypt*, p. 9.

Majesty, born of the royal mother Sen-senb, who is in good health. This is sent to thee that thou mayest know that the royal house is prosperous and in good health and condition—the 1st year, the 21st day of the 3rd month Phamenoth, the day of coronation.’¹

At this point in the Egyptian history Professor Maspero breaks off to review rapidly but clearly the rise of the Cossæans, and to describe most graphically the Syrian peoples who were approximately contemporaneous with the Hyksôs in Egypt (pp. 111 *et seq.*).

The Kahshu or Cossæans originally had their home in the wild country of Zagros, which borders on Media and Elam. They were, as might be expected, a lawless horde who improved every opportunity that presented itself of suddenly dashing down into the fertile plains of Chaldæa, raiding them and making off with as much plunder as they could lay their hands on. Once in their mountain fastnesses again the frontier garrison preferred not to meddle with them. They were star-worshippers, and but semi-civilized. However, in the eighteenth century B.C. they succeeded in taking Babylon, adopted Bel as their own divinity, and venerated his temple at Ekur. They, in fact, played the same part in the Euphrates valley that the Hyksôs did in the Nile. It is quite clear that they were an undisciplined wild people, quite ready to adore their kings one day and murder them the next.

The inhabitants of Syria appeared to the Egyptians at this time to be divided into four branches, which are not always clearly defined from a geographical point of view. They were the Kheftiu, the Zahi, the Lotanu and the Kharû. Roughly speaking, the Kheftiu were the Phœnicians, and the dwellers on the sea coast, the Zahi, occupied that wide border of Syria joining on to Egypt; the Kharû lay to the south-east of this, and included part of Mount Seir, and the Lotanu dwelt among the hills which divide the Shephelah from the Jordan (p. 121). We know the look of many of these people from the vivid drawings on tomb and temple walls in Egypt, where their racial characteristics are strongly insisted upon by the artist. The series of racial types published by Professor Petrie is invaluable to the student of ethnology, as it contains photographs of every type and race sculptured by Egyptian artists. These people are all alluded to shortly by Maspero, and it is quite evident from his method of dealing with them in this work that his object is not so much to give their history as to let his readers understand who they are, and to

¹ *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, xxix. 117.

enabl
world.
history
then g
these p
of Egy
rise of
XIX. I
tribes
chapter

One
makes,
Now th
long a
that it
a fortif
Thothn
pero se
towers
of road
general
rounded
gates;
serious
the Pha

‘Ces
accumul
apercevo
entier pe
face du p
celées co
de victoi
il est vra
que nous
des plus
quérants,
même, a
des servi
aux siècl
côté de la
saillie de
laïres don
Dès qu’o
nerie, pre
lucarnes,
des lieux
spective

VOL.

enable them to realize their exact position in the ancient world. After all, at this date the only nation which had a history of sufficient interest to be minutely recorded was the then great world-empire of Egypt, and it is only in so far as these people are referred to by, or as they affect, the history of Egypt that Maspero writes of them. For years after the rise of the Thothmes, in fact all through the XVIII. and XIX. Dynasties, Egypt was warring with Syria and her various tribes and with the great Hittite kingdom; so that this chapter on the Syrian and Phœnician peoples is invaluable.

One very interesting archæological statement Maspero makes, and that is that Medinet Habû was a *Migdol* (p. 129). Now that marvellous building of Ramses III. has been for long a great puzzle to archæologists; some have contended that it was merely a temple, and others have seen in it a fortification added to the already existing temple of Thothmes III. Some have even thought it a palace. Maspero sees in it a copy of a Canaanitish watch-tower. These towers appear to have been erected in villages, at the bends of roads, by ravines, and by fords: if possible, they were generally perched up on the spur of a hill. They were surrounded by double-enclosing walls, and guarded by massive gates; and an attack on a large Canaanite Migdol was a serious undertaking, even for the well-disciplined troops of the Pharaoh.

‘Ces boulevards de la civilisation cananéenne, qu’elle avait accumulés par centaines sur le chemin des envahisseurs, nous n’en apercevons plus la trace aujourd’hui, soit qu’ils aient été tous rasés en entier pendant l’une des révolutions qui ont si souvent bouleversé la face du pays, soit qu’ils dissimulent leur débris sous les ruines amoncelées comme à plaisir depuis plus de trente siècles. Les tableaux de victoire gravés sur les parois des temples thébains nous rendent, il est vrai, plusieurs traits de leur physionomie générale, mais l’idée que nous pourrions nous créer d’eux d’après ces reproductions serait des plus confuses, si l’un des derniers parmi les Pharaons conquérants, Ramses III, ne s’était avisé d’en construire un à Thèbes même, afin d’y enfermer sa chapelle funéraire et d’y loger le peuple des serviteurs attaché à son culte. Une partie en a été renversée aux siècles grecs et romains, mais l’avant-mur subsiste encore du côté de la plaine, ainsi que la porte, battue sur la droite par une saillie de l’enceinte, et flanquée de deux corps de gardes rectangulaires dont les terrasses dominent la courtine d’un mètre environ. Dès qu’on la franchie, on se trouve en face d’un *migdol* en maçonnerie, presque carré, avec ses deux ailes, avec ses parois trouées de lucarnes, avec sa cour qui va se rétrécissant par ressauts, et l’examen des lieux nous révèle plus d’un arrangement que la médiocre perspective des Egyptiens nous empêchait de soupçonner. Nous

apprenons ainsi que le gros œuvre se dressait sur un soubassement en talus qui mesure cinq mètres à peu près. Il servait à deux fins : d'abord il augmentait la résistance contre la sape, ensuite les projectiles que les assiégés lançaient du chemin de ronde, ricochant avec violence sur l'inclinaison du plan, tenaient l'ennemi à distance. Le tout a fière mine, et s'il faut admettre que les architectes royaux chargés de satisfaire cette fantaisie souveraine y ont apporté un souci du détail inconnu aux peuples dont ils copiaient l'œuvre, ils ont imité les dispositions de l'ensemble assez fidèlement pour que nous concevions bonne opinion du modèle. Transportez ce *Migdol* de Ramses III en Asie, sur l'un de ces mamelons où les Cananéens avaient accoutumé de jucher les leurs, répandez à ses pieds quelques vingtaines de cahutes basses et sales, et la silhouette de ce village improvisé rappellera de façon étrange celle de Zérin, de Béitin, ou de telle autre bourgade moderne qui rallie ses maisons de fellahs autour d'une grande fabrique en pierre massive, hôtellerie pour les voyageurs attardés ou château du temps des Croisades' (p. 129).

Professor Maspero, in this second chapter, gives a first-rate *résumé* of the salient features of the local cults prevalent in Syria, with the names and functions of the chief gods and goddesses (pp. 154 *et seqq.*). Their religious rites and their atrocious sacrifices form a strange contrast to what is known of the Egyptian religion and forms of worship. This part of the chapter is particularly interesting as throwing some strong side lights upon incidents that are mentioned in the Old Testament, such as the sacrifice of Mesha's firstborn son upon the city wall (2 Kings iii. 27), the mourning of the Jewish women for Tammuz (Ezekiel viii. 14-16), and the cutting of their flesh by the prophets of Baal (1 Kings xviii. 28), &c.

The Phœnicians do not commend themselves to our notice, and there is every reason to accept Maspero's account of them as impartial and unprejudiced. They were ever liars and pirates, whatever good qualities they may have added on to these traits; and the incidents told of them by the classic writers do not tend to raise them in our estimation:—

'Étaient-ils plus marchands que pirates ou plus pirates que marchands? Ils n'en savaient trop rien eux-mêmes, et leur conduite vis-à-vis des bateaux qu'ils rencontraient en mer ou des tribus qu'ils fréquentaient se réglait sur les circonstances du moment. Lorsqu'en abordant ils ne se sentaient point les plus forts, le marchand prévalait aussitôt et il imposait silence aux instincts du pirate. Ils débarquaient paisiblement, se conciliaient par de petits présents la bienveillance du chef et des nobles, puis ils étalaient leurs pacotilles, et ils se contentaient, au pis-aller, du gain légitime que l'échange leur procurait. Ils n'étaient jamais pressés, séjournaient dans un endroit aussi longtemps qu'ils pensaient ne pas en avoir épuisé les

ressou
qu'ils d
les hom
ciselés
amulett
étouffes
quefois
essayaie
les hom
nuit. L
bonne f
sur la fé
dépouill
gens, le
esclavag
prix. C
danger
féroces

Ha
social
more t
follow
fascina
of the
Thothr
attempt
hetep I
death
This pr
the kin
pedigre
the thro
king's c
and wh
this the
to his
success
from th
at Gize

Ha
ancient
she app
prosper
reduced
attentio
Sen-mô

ressources, s'entendaient merveilleusement à achalander la denrée qu'ils déballaient. Ils avaient des armes d'usage ou d'apparat pour les hommes, des haches, des glaives, des poignards damasquinés ou ciselés à poignée d'or ou d'ivoire, des bracelets, des colliers, des amulettes de toute sorte, des vases émaillés, des verroteries, des étoffes teintes en pourpre ou brodées de couleurs criardes. Quelquefois les indigènes, surexcités à la vue de ces belles choses, essayaient de s'en emparer par ruse ou par violence : ils assassinaient les hommes descendus à terre ou surprenaient l'équipage pendant la nuit. Le plus souvent c'étaient les Phéniciens qui abusaient de la bonne foi ou de la faiblesse de leurs hôtes : ils fondaient en traitres sur la foule désarmée au moment où le trafic battait son plein, ils dépouillaient et tuaient les vieillards, ils enchaînaient les jeunes gens, les femmes, les enfants, puis ils les emmenaient vendre en esclavage, sur les marchés où le bétail humain était taxé au plus haut prix. C'était un métier comme un autre, mais qui les exposait au danger de représailles et qui soulevait contre eux des haines féroces' (p. 195).

Having given us some insight into the characters and social ways of Egypt's neighbours, Maspero returns once more to his favourite theme, and in the third chapter we follow the fortunes of the XVIII. Dynasty, one of the most fascinating periods of history, containing the life and works of the great Queen Hatshepsut and her warrior nephew, Thothmes III., the Alexander of Egyptian history, and the attempted reformation of religion and art under Amenhetep IV., otherwise called Khu-n-aten. Thothmes I. at his death left but one son—Thothmes II., who succeeded him. This prince's mother, Mût-nefert, although distantly related to the king her husband, was not sufficiently distinguished by pedigree to admit of her son being declared heir-apparent ; the throne would therefore have descended to Hatshepsut, the king's daughter by Aahmes, who was of the direct royal line, and who was, moreover, older than her half-brother. To obviate this the king, shortly before his death, married Thothmes II. to his half-sister Hatshepsut, thereby securing to him the succession. He appears to have lived but a short time, and from the examination of his mummy—now in the Museum at Gîzeh—it is certain that he suffered from bad health.

Hatshepsut is one of the most interesting figures in ancient history. Clear-sighted, clever, and very determined, she appears to have brought the country to a condition of prosperity unequalled by any other monarch. Having reduced the Syrian tribes to submission, she turned her attention to the arts of peace and, aided by her chief architect Sen-mût, beautified Thebes with that magnificent and unique

H H 2

temple of Dêr-el-Bahari, which Professor Naville, on behalf of the Egypt Exploration Fund, has so carefully excavated during the past three years. On the walls of it are recorded most graphically, in a series of pictures with accompanying hieroglyphs, the story of the expedition to the Land of Punt for the purpose of bringing back the incense trees to plant in the garden of Amen Ra, at Thebes. Perhaps the treaty made between the Prince of Punt and the ambassadors of the great queen was the earliest pacific treaty of commerce made between Egypt and the outside world. Certain, we believe, it is, that the transplanting of those incense trees is the earliest recorded occasion of an attempt to acclimatise plants in the country, an attempt which, judging from the charming representations of Thothmes III.'s garden on the walls of the temple of Karnak, must have been thoroughly successful. It is to this queen also that the temple of Amen was indebted for the red granite obelisks, raised that 'my name may remain and live in this temple for ever.' They were quarried each of them in one single block in the mountain side at Aswân, under the direction of Sen-mût; and in seven months' time these great monoliths were polished, inscribed, and stood upright in their places. One only is now erect, and quite dwarfs its neighbour raised by Thothmes III.; the other lies fallen, broken in two. After a time Hatshepsut seems to have expended some of her energies in bringing the Delta, a somewhat neglected part of her kingdom, into order; and the canals were cleared out and the roads improved.

At the death of the queen, her nephew Thothmes III. came into possession of a country whose resources had been husbanded, and which had been saved from the strain and expenditure of war. Hatshepsut was a quiet, peace-loving woman; her successor was essentially a restless warrior, and from his reign dates the line of kings whose one and only idea was the extension of Egyptian territory at the expense of the very life of the country. Superficially the empire of Egypt was at its zenith under the reigns of the Thothmes and the Ramessides of the XIX. Dynasty; but to the student of history there were already visible the signs of decay. Although it was the proud boast of Thothmes III. that he 'placed his boundaries where he willed,' and Ramses II. vaingloriously declared, 'I repulsed millions of people by myself alone,' we know that when the troops of Egypt found themselves face to face with the Hittite warriors the victory was not decisive, and after fifteen campaigns a treaty

of peace
the Hittite

In c
and th
Maspe
learned
At pag
life of
Effendi
harim
many c
led to
Pentau
made,
Peter L
this fan
papyri,
peculiar
the real

The
at this
lived a
which
steadily
and no
even w
Ramess
affectati
country
speakin
XX. D
supersti
given p
observed
and mo
this per
most in
Peuples
in the t
des Peup

It ha
history
the wea
has him
portiona

of peace was signed, which was ratified by the marriage of the Hittite princess to Ramses II.

In drawing to a close the history of the Theban Empire, and the rise of the priestly power in Egypt, Professor Maspero, in the fifth chapter, turns aside to give a learned analysis of the social life of the people at this period. At page 159 we learn that in the land of Kamit of old the life of the sovereign was not any safer than it is in the Effendina's to-day. Ramses III. nearly fell a victim to a harim conspiracy, conceived upon a large scale, in which many of the court officials were implicated. Its discovery led to the execution of forty men and six women; while Pentaur, who seems to have really been the instigator, was made, as a supreme punishment, 'to die of himself.' Sir Peter Le Page Renouf has given one of the best analyses of this famous trial, which is contained in no less than three papyri, and it was he who first pointed out the force of the peculiar reflective form of the Egyptian verb, and suggested the real meaning of it.

The people of Egypt were as a nation rapidly degenerating at this time, the upper and lower classes alike. The former lived a life of idleness and luxury; while the foreign element, which for two centuries had been assimilated and had steadily increased in strength, was surely making itself felt, and not for the good of the country. The very language even was changing under this influence, and under the Ramessides we notice a large number of Semitic words and affectations both of writing and speech. The religion of the country was becoming seriously affected also, and it is not speaking too strongly when we say that by the end of the XX. Dynasty Egypt was priest-ridden, and steeped in superstition. Magical rites, incantations, and spells had given place to the religious spirit which is so clearly to be observed in the Early and Middle Empire; and the mental and moral and spiritual tone of the nation was feeble. It is at this period that the Egyptian section—which is by far the most interesting and important—of *Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples* breaks off, leaving the fall of the Empire to be told in the third and concluding volume of the *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient*.

It has been said by some reviewers that the notes in this history seem to be poor in some places when compared with the wealth of them in others. To this criticism M. Maspero has himself given an answer. The notes are added proportionately to the facility of obtaining books upon the

several points. With regard to certain vexed questions of Egyptology, &c., much of the information can only be gained by the laborious search through numbers of pamphlets, proceedings, transactions, &c., stowed away for the most part in the libraries of public societies or learned bodies. In these cases indications are given as to where the information can be obtained; where books upon the subject in question are better known and in more frequent use, they are not suggested.

The *Premières Mêlées des Peuples* is a splendid contribution to the history of antiquity, and invaluable to scholar and student alike. The former will find it replete with information admirably backed up by references to the works of other authors; and the latter will find the story of antiquity told so simply and graphically that perforce he will read it, and may be he will be led to study it.

The point at which the *Church Quarterly Review* must record, regretfully but decidedly, that it dissents from some of the opinions of the learned author, is when he draws certain strongly defined conclusions based upon the shallow speculations of the 'Higher Critics.' The *Church Quarterly Review* has over and over again set forth—and that with no wavering voice—the grounds of that dissent, and want of space alone prevents us from once more setting them forth to our readers. Professor Maspero undoubtedly gives an admirable *résumé* of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and part of 1 Kings and 1 Chronicles, but some of the conclusions to which he comes are such as this *Review* cannot possibly tolerate.

After entering this caveat we may be permitted to express the surprise with which we heard that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—a Society of reputed orthodoxy—had undertaken the translation of a book which in the first place is scarcely in its 'line,' and in the second could hardly, in the Hebrew section, have been in harmony with that form of sound teaching which it was founded to champion and promulgate. From the advertisements of the S.P.C.K. we are led to expect a translation, and this, if faithfully carried out, must, in parts of one chapter at least, have required the Society to set its *imprimatur* upon opinions which in honesty to its subscribers it not only cannot promulgate, but is bound to combat.

Turning now to the English edition of *Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples*, we are at a loss to know how to deal with

it, or wishes curate from in views a tracted be a l 'sins, n

Its calls t The tr the tit Assyri to hav exceed of As with t has pu of An

It adopte book i to us, and w to us, beyon volum lation, point equiva blund histor and a the Fr have a the in pour l

W follow On On tablet trans O is left

it, or from what point of view to regard it. The S.P.C.K. wishes the public to accept it as a translation, but an inaccurate paraphrase, full of blunders made either from haste or from inadequate knowledge of French—in which the author's views are in some places distorted, his notes added to, subtracted from, and, in some cases at least, omitted—would be a better description of it. It is, in fact, full of literary 'sins, negligences, and ignorances.'

Its very title-page is inaccurate. The learned author calls this volume *Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples* only. The translator omits the *Premières* altogether, and translates the title *The Struggle of the Nations—Egypt, Syria, and Assyria*. The book is edited by Sayce, but why it is necessary to have an editorial preface it is hard to say, and certainly the exceedingly feeble production from the pen of the Professor of Assyriology at Oxford will not assist it to find favour with the scientific public. Professor Maspero most wisely has put neither preface nor introduction to his second volume of *Ancient History*, and indeed it requires neither.

It is impossible to discover what has been the principle adopted; for even allowing every latitude to a translator, the book is full of blunders and inaccuracies. This is surprising to us, as Professor Maspero's French is so exceedingly simple and wonderfully free from technical expressions. It seems to us, also, that the translator's license has been stretched beyond its rightful limits; for on carefully comparing the two volumes throughout, we must confess that it is not a translation, but a very free paraphrase. In many places, also, the point of a word is lost by the failure to represent it by the equivalent English one. In one instance (page 69) a serious blunder has been made, causing Maspero to make a very false historical statement; Professor Sayce here rushes into the fray, and apparently without comparing the English version with the French original, commits himself to a note he never would have added had he done so. The mistake arises solely from the inability of the translator to distinguish between 'construire pour lui' and 'se construire pour lui.'

What is to be thought of blunders such as the following?—

On page 10, notes 1 and 2 are misplaced.

On page 18, note 3 states that the earliest cuneiform tablets of Syrian origin are not earlier than the 'XVI siècle,' translated as 'XIV century.'

On page 18, in note 5, after line 3, the following phrase is left out, 'désigne à la fois ouest, puis le vent d'ouest.'

Note 2 of page 28 contains the following interpolated sentence—'whom Mr. Pinches has found in a contract table associated with Pungunila as king.' What right has either translator or editor to add to the author's text without calling attention to the fact?

Page 29, note 2, line 7.—'La glose' is missed out.

Page 45, note 3.—'In the Minæan inscriptions of Southern Arabia the name is found under the form of Ammi-Zadiq,' is not in the original.

Page 15, line 1, 'vers le XVI siècle' is translated as 'about the VI century B.C.' On line 3 'les ports' is left out.

Page 442, line 10, 'une version accessoire du même récit ajoute des détails précis sur leur condition' is rendered, 'Further details on their condition are supplied in the following verses of the Biblical narrative.'

Page 444, note 2, 'reculer' is translated 'assign.'

Page 690, note 2, 'qui est aussi la plus courte' has been missed out of the text.

Page 710, line 5, 'son seigneur dans la paix et dans la guerre' has been translated 'their appointed lord.'

We wonder why a '*héros* mythique' should be a 'mythical *hero*,' while a '*héros* solaire' is a 'solar *deity*,' and we do not consider 'arbitrary' the correct translation of 'spéculatif.' The word 'harim' can have but one rendering; but the translator, in the case of Solomon, prefers to use the Western but incorrect term, 'household.' She also does not seem to perceive the difference between an 'étalon' and a 'haras'; and she has blundered sadly between 'les milices' and 'la milice.' 'Chars' are not 'charioteers,' neither is 'se succéder' to be 'successful'; and we hardly think that a 'moment propice' is of necessity a 'decisive moment,' nor are 'ces femmes' 'these princesses'; and we should not think 'death' the suitable translation of 'suicide,' nor 'according to the treaty' of 'après la tradition.' These probably are all faults of ignorance.

The following parallel passages speak for themselves of the careless method of translation, and are only a few examples among the many of like kind which prevail throughout the book:—

'Qetourah une simple concubine' (p. 66, l. 2).

'Sous l'accoutrement pittoresque d'hiéroglyphes dont les scribes égyptiens les ont affublés' (p. 15, l. 5).

'Keturah, who was merely a second wife.'

'In the hieroglyphic disguise which they bear on the Egyptian geographical lists.'

¹ Keturah was not the wife of Abraham.—1 Chron. i. 32.

'Le

15).

'Le

Lagash

elle av

ainsi q

Larsan

'Qu

ou qu'

collecti

sans tro

Ra,' &c

'La

les chr

'De

putaien

'Tigre'

'An

ture pos

'Pro

en litig

(p. 710,

'N'

pour l

son rep

If

were th

it will

formid

inadeq

the aut

this cl

transla

mutilat

the tex

opinion

the S.E

as to b

the wh

cerned

absolut

beginni

specime

employ

'Un

avait

'Les rois *Hyksôs*' (p. 72, l. 15).

'Les rois et les vicaires de Lagash s'étaient mesurés contre elle avec des chances variées *ainsi que ceux d'Ourou et de Larsam.*'

'Qu'il s'appelât déjà Jahvéh ou qu'il se contentât du nom collectif d'Elohim, ils l'adorèrent *sans trop d'infidélités* en face de Ra,' &c. (p. 72).

'La période d'hégémonie que les chroniques,' &c. (p. 73).

'Des Sémites . . . *se disputaient* les berges orientales du Tigre' (p. 83, l. 3).

'Ammiditana *n'est qu'une lecture possible*' (p. 45, n. 2).

'Presque en face du *poste en litige, au revers du défilé*' (p. 710, l. 10).

'N'eut que *des malédictions* pour l'imprudent qui troublait son repos' (p. 720, l. 19).

If sins of ignorance and carelessness such as the above were the only ones of which the Reviewer had to complain, it will have been seen that they would in themselves make a formidable array, and condemn the translation as utterly inadequate; but when to these must be added that of altering the author's text, the charge becomes serious. Unfortunately this charge, grave as it is, must be brought against the translator and the Society, at whose instigation possibly the mutilation of the text was made. On certain questions of the textual criticism of the Old Testament Professor Maspero's opinions are altered, toned down to accord with the views of the S.P.C.K., and in many cases so completely twisted round as to be hardly recognisable. We do not hesitate to say that the whole portion of *The Struggle of the Nations* which is concerned with the history of the Hebrews or their writings is absolutely worthless as a translation. It is perverted from beginning to end. We give part of pages 703, 704 as a specimen—and that by no means the worst—of the method employed for adapting Maspero's views to those of the S.P.C.K.

'Un de ses chefs, Samson, avait laissé une réputation

'The *shepherd kings.*'

'The kings and vicegerents of Lagash had measured force with Anshan *as well as with Uru and Larsam.*'

'Whether he was already known to them as Jahveh or was worshipped under the collective name of Elohim, they served him *with almost unbroken fidelity*, even in the presence of Ra,' &c.

'The centuries of *rule* attributed by the chronicles.'

'Semites . . . *pushed forward* as far as the east bank of the Tigris.'

'The name *has been transcribed* Ammiditana.'

'Almost opposite to the *stronghold taken from them.*'

'Had no *words of comfort* for the god-forsaken man who had troubled his repose.'

'One of their chiefs, Samson, had a great reputation among

d'audace et de vigueur extraordinaires, mais le détail de ses actions véritables avait été oublié de bonne heure. On ne savait de lui que les bons tours joués aux Philistins, et l'on s'égayait volontiers des armes bizarres qu'il avait employées: n'avait-il pas assommé mille d'entre eux avec une mâchoire d'âne? n'avait-il pas brûlé leurs récoltes en y lâchant trois cents renards liés et traînant des torches aux queues? Une nuit qu'il avait aventuré dans Gaza pour y courtoiser une hiérodoule on avait renfermé sur lui les portes et l'on se flattait de le tenir prisonnier: il démonta les vantaux, les huisseries, la barre, et charria le tout sur ses épaules jusqu'au sommet de la montagne qui est en face d'Hébron. La trahison de Dalila le livre enfin à ses ennemis. On lui crève les yeux, on le condamne à tourner la meule dans sa prison, et un jour de fête, les princes de Gaza l'amènent au temple où ils banquettaient avec leurs clients: tandis qu'ils se raillent de lui, il renverse d'un suprême effort les deux colonnes entre lesquelles on l'avait placé et le plafond, l'écrasant, écrase du même coup la multitude assemblée pour rire de sa honte.¹ Les Danites finirent par se lasser de ces luttes sans résultat, et ils se résolurent à chercher des parages défendus moins opiniâtrement. Ils envoyèrent cinq émissaires explorer ce pays. Ceux-ci en traversant la

them for his bravery and bodily strength, and we have some details of his history. The episodes which have been preserved deal with some of his exploits against the Philistines, and there is a certain humour in the chronicler's account of the weapons which he employed: "with the jawbone of an ass have I smitten a thousand men:" he burned up their harvest also by letting go three hundred foxes with torches attached to their tails among the standing corn of the Philistines. Various events in his career are subsequently narrated, such as his adventure in the house of the harlot at Gaza, when he carried off the gate of the city and the gate posts to the top of the mountain that is before Hebron. By Delila's treachery he was finally delivered over to his enemies, who, having put out his eyes, condemned him to grind in the prison-house. On the occasion of a great festival in honour of Dagon he was brought into the temple to amuse his captors, but while they were making merry at his expense, he took hold of the two pillars against which he was resting and "bowing himself with all his might" overturned them, "and the house fell upon the lords, and upon all the people that were therein."¹ The tribe of Dan at length became weary of these unprofitable struggles and determined to seek out another and more easily

¹ 'Samson a été considéré par plusieurs savants comme étant un héros solaire (H. Husson, *La légende de Samson et les Mythes Solaires*, 1869. Steinhal, *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, tome ii., pp. 110-120, 129-178. Goldziher, *Der Mythos bei den Hebräern*, p. 128.)'

¹ 'Some learned critics considered Samson to have been a sort of solar deity (H. Husson, &c.)'

mont
un épi
avait
Jahvêh
entrep
rent ve
une v
habita
vivaier
niens,
à les
décide
guerrie
six cen
de Mi
devant
change
Dan.
l'éphod
shom,
fils fun
Danite
captivi
montra
d'avant
aux fr
un des
peut-ê

2 'J
qui es
dans Jo
état ac
mêlés,
restitut
Die Bü
pp. 138
cendan
ce sanc
ment
copistes
Manass
xviii. 3
lut poin

montagne d'Ephraïm consultèrent un éphod qu'un certain Michée avait consacré sur ses terres : *Jahvèh leur prédit le succès de leur entreprise, et, de fait, ils découvrirent vers la source du Jourdain une ville de Laish, dont les habitants tranquilles et confiants vivaient à la manière des Sidoniens, sans que personne songeât à les inquiéter. Leur rapport décide la tribu à émigrer : les guerriers partent au nombre de six cents, vont au passage l'éphod de Michée et le lévite qui officiait devant lui, surprennent Laish et changent son nom en celui de Dan. "Ils y dressèrent pour eux l'éphod, et Jonathan, fils de Gershon, fils de Moïse, lui et ses fils furent sacrificateurs pour les Danites jusqu'au jour de la captivité du pays."*² Dan se montra, dans ce poste périlleux d'avant-garde, ce qu'il avait été aux frontières de la Shéphélah, un des plus belliqueux qu'il y eût peut-être dans tout Israël.

² 'L'histoire de cette migration, qui est indiquée sommairement dans Josué xix. 47, se compose en son état actuel de deux récits entremêlés, dont on trouvera une restitution probable dans Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuelis, pp. 138-146. La présence d'un descendant de Moïse comme prêtre de ce sanctuaire local blessa le sentiment religieux de l'un de ces copistes ; il substitua le nom de Manassé à celui de Moïse (Juges xviii. 30), correction qui ne prévalut point.'

defensible settlement. They sent out five emissaries, therefore, to look out for a new home. While these were passing through the mountains they called upon a certain Micah in the hill country of Ephraim and lodged there. Here they took counsel of a Levite whom Micah had made his priest, and in answer to the question, whether their journey would be prosperous, he told them to "Go in peace: before the Lord is the way wherein ye go." Their search turned out successful, for they discovered near the sources of the Jordan the town of Laish, whose people, like the Zidonians, dwelt in security, fearing no trouble. On the report of the emissaries Dan decided to emigrate: the warriors set out to the number of 600, carried off with them the priest of Micah and his ephod, teraphim and graven image, and succeeded in capturing Laish, to which they gave the name of their tribe. "The children of Dan set up for themselves the graven image, and Jonathan the son of Gershon, the son of Moses, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites until the day of the captivity of the land."²

² 'Some critics see in the history of this migration, which is given summarily in Joshua xix. 47, a blending of two accounts. Budde has attempted a reconstruction of the narrative. The presence of a descendant of Moses as priest in this local sanctuary probably offended the religious scruples of the copyist, who substituted Manasseh for Moses (Judges xviii. 30), but the correction was not generally accepted. [The Revised Version reads "Moses" where the authorized text (and the LXX. also) has "Manasseh."—Tr.]'

The italics throughout are the reviewer's.

The tribe of Dan displayed in this advanced post of peril the bravery it had shown on the frontiers of the Shephelah, and showed itself the most bellicose of the tribes of Israel.'

In the first instance the translator has entirely altered the author's meaning. The latter distinctly says that the history of the *real* feats of Samson was early lost, which we can well understand, and that all we know of him are his practical jokes played upon the Philistines. This is nothing less than an apparently deliberate falsification of Professor Maspero's statements:—

- (2) The translator has inserted a phrase not in the original.
- (3) The author's statement has been completely altered; in fact, it is no translation at all, but a sentence introduced without a shadow of authority.
- (4) 'Les princes de Gaza' is entirely omitted and 'in honour of Dagon' inserted instead.
- (5) Another sentence invented by the translator, instead of a correct rendering of the author's words.
- (6) A mistranslation, for 'explorer un pays' and 'look out for a new home' are not one and the same thing by any means.
- (7) Another falsifying of the author's words.
- (8) A falsification of the original text.
- (9) We will conclude here that the translator has made a slip and translated 'graven image' instead of 'Ephod' by mistake.
- (10) 'Some learned critics' is not the equivalent of 'plusieurs savants.'
- (11) The whole of note 2 has been so twisted round, that it is made to bear a meaning which is contrary to that of the author.

Here, then, we have in one page no less than eleven discrepancies. Of what value can a translation executed in such a manner possibly be? It is worse than useless; and it is unfair to both the author and the public. We have only to read a very little way in the *Struggle of the Nations* to see at once that the English translation can hardly be said to convey the meaning of the original at all, and however strongly we dissent from Maspero's Biblical criticism, we feel that a book put forth as a translation should at least be honest. We do not blame the S.P.C.K. if they thoroughly disapprove of some of the author's views; we do not see that

they ca
why, t
book?
ago, w
Maspe
criticis
back fi
why th
though
actual
exister

Gra
splend
"throug
stay th
felt it
and fee
not sub
the S.K
preface
a trans
are thr
have b
course
has iss
lation
the edi
'the w
Society
itself
'impro
The pu
kind—
a blun
as they
much t
Cha
Chapte
deliber
some o
so-calle
scores
ever m
the tra
word c

they can do otherwise consistently with their position. But why, then, did they publish a so-called translation of his book? there was no need for them to do so. Many years ago, when the writer of this article was a student in Paris, Maspero took up a very distinct line with regard to Biblical criticism; he made no secret of it, and he has never gone back from it. This fact makes it all the more a problem why the Society undertook the production of a work which, though absolutely invaluable, was, they knew, in one portion actually at variance with the fundamental object of their existence.

Granted that Maspero's history of Egypt and Assyria is splendid, and his last chapter with its critical notes wrong throughout, that one chapter alone should have caused them to stay their hand before undertaking to publish it. Having felt it incumbent upon them to produce an English edition, and feeling that Maspero's opinions upon certain points were not sufficiently orthodox to be reproduced with the *cachet* of the S.P.C.K. upon them, why did they not boldly say in the preface, 'This historical work is invaluable, therefore we issue a translation of it; but on questions of Biblical criticism we are throughout at variance with the author'? This would have been perfectly reasonable and justifiable, and to such a course no one would have objected. As it is, the Society has issued what they wish the public to believe is a translation of *Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples*, and which they, the editor and translator, must know is far from being what 'the writer wrote.' It is a grievous pity that a religious Society, and one so much respected as the S.P.C.K., has put itself in the painful and wholly unnecessary position of 'improving'—or shall we say Bowdlerising?—an author's text. The public confidence is shaken in it after an action of this kind—an action which we would fain believe savours more of a blunder than a crime; for, after all, the faults, innumerable as they are, running through the work, may be due quite as much to incompetence as wilfulness.

Chapters I. and II. are full of translator's errors; but Chapter VII. contains an immense number of apparently deliberate inaccuracies as well as blunders in translation, and some of them are very glaring. What weight can be given to a so-called translation which in one chapter numbers more than scores of discrepancies between itself and the original? However much we dissent from the author, we cannot but feel that the translator has no right to make alterations without one word of intimation to the reader, nor do we think that the

publishers should allow such a translation to go out with their sanction. We feel it to be a breach of faith to their subscribers and the public. It is with anxiety we look forward to the third volume of the *Histoire de l'Orient*, which, we understand, must perforce remain in the Society's hands, and it is not with an easy mind that we think of the probable accuracy of other translations put forth by the same house. We ought to feel that the S.P.C.K. is far above suspicion of any sort—in fact, that it is straightforward even to fastidiousness.

We will take a few pages at random from one chapter, so that the public may judge for themselves of the translation.

On page 675, line 2, the original runs thus: 'Comme les divinités de la Syrie il avait le caractère jaloux, farouche, sans pitié de qui l'offensait: on l'adorait en ses statues de bête, peut-être d'homme, que son esprit animait afin de prédire l'avenir, et on lui érigeait aux endroits qu'il honorait de ses apparitions, des dolmens, des menhirs, des stèles semblables à celles des divinités cananéennes.' The translation gives this sentence a very different complexion: 'He is described as being a "jealous God," brooking no rival, "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." We hear of His having been adored under the figure of a "calf," and of His Spirit inspiring His prophets as well as of the anointed stones which were dedicated in His honour.' This is not even a paraphrase, far less is it a bungling attempt to turn French into English; it is neither more nor less than deliberate alteration. On line 15 '*Les chroniqueurs essayèrent de combinaisons multiples pour ne pas rester en deçà du chiffre fatidique ou pour ne point le dépasser*' becomes '*The Jewish chroniclers attempted by various combinations to prove that the sacred number of tribes was the correct one.*' While in the last line 'The tribal organization had not reached its full development at the time of the sojourn in the desert' does duty for 'Le système flottait encore pendant le séjour au désert.'

In note 1 the entire part of a sentence, 'Pour ce caractère de Jahvéh,' is omitted. In Note 2 'On signale aussi celle du serpent (2 Rois xviii. 4)' is left out.

On page 679 'La tradition' is called 'the sacred writings,' and in line 14 'became their leader' is interpolated. The greater part of note 3 is omitted.

On page 680 there are three discrepancies.

On page 681 there are three discrepancies, including the omission of part of note 4.

On page 685, note 2 states that a certain episode 'repose, de l'aveu général, sur une tradition sans valeur;' this is rendered

as 'by
omitted

Page

Page

Note 1

lated a

Page

crut pl

tained

Page

any rat

become

entirely

consider

On

'hoplite

Page

is altere

Page

descend

men, o

which t

'Grand

sa cour

de Thè

sans int

to the s

that he

sovereig

the sour

de Jour

rendered

'David'

On

ses plais

front of

On

dotale'

On

l'Empire

celui d'I

puis il s

which th

ment .

over He

as 'by some critics rejected as spurious.' Note 5 is entirely omitted.

Page 686 contains four discrepancies.

Page 692: 'une image en bois lamée d'or' is left out. Note 1 is omitted. Note 2 is omitted. Note 3 is so mutilated as to be hardly recognisable.

Page 706: 'elle renfermait deux pierres sur lesquelles on crut plus tard que la loi avait été gravée' is translated as 'contained the two tables of the Mosaic law.'

Page 712: 'La réalité fut moins brillante' is translated 'at any rate.' Note 2: 'le fait ne nous est connu que par,' &c., becomes 'the fact is known to us,' which gives the sentence an entirely different complexion. While notes 3 and 4 have been considerably altered to suit views other than those of Maspero.

On page 713 a whole phrase is left out, and the word 'hoplites' is omitted.

Page 714: 'La tradition' becomes 'the narrative.' Note 5 is altered, and the end of note 6 is omitted.

Page 730: 'Le dernier descendant d'Elie' is rendered 'a descendant;' while the following sentence is only one specimen, out of a great many, of the ingenious methods by which the sense of the author's opinions has been twisted: 'Grand par l'épée, il s'appuyait sur l'épée, et s'il avouait tenir sa couronne de Jahvé, c'était à la façon dont les souverains de Thèbes ou de Ninive tenaient la leur d'Amon ou d'Assour, sans intermédiaire de prêtre' — 'While David owed everything to the sword and trusted in it, he recognized at the same time that he had obtained his crown from Jahveh just as the sovereigns of Thebes and Nineveh saw in Ammon and Assur the source of their own royal authority.' 'Sur la rive gauche de Jourdain' is omitted. 'Le détail en fut vite oublié' is rendered 'the details are not given.' 'La garde philistine' is 'David's guard,' and 'les prisonniers' are 'Moabite captives.'

On page 734: 'et supprimé le mari dont l'existence gênait ses plaisirs' is translated 'and placing her husband in the forefront of the battle brought about his death.'

On page 750 note 1 is omitted, and 'la tradition sacerdotale' becomes 'the fact.'

On page 757 Maspero writes that 'le centre de gravité de l'Empire . . . dépassa les bornes du centre, dont un au moins, celui d'Héracléopolis, avait exercé une suprématie transitoire, puis il s'arrêta au Delta, et il oscilla de droite et de gauche,' which the translator expresses thus: 'The centre of government . . . now gradually returned northwards, and passing over *Heliopolis*, which had exercised a transitory supremacy,

at length established itself in the Delta,' which makes nonsense, as Maspero is particularly alluding to the transitory rule of the *Heracleopolitan* monarchs. We never heard of any royal supremacy being established at On!

Page 759 we read that 'le grand prêtre se levait le matin à heure fixe, et dès ce moment il appartenait aux offices de son état corps et âme.' Why has the translator finished the sentence at 'heure fixe'? This is not the first time that, without any apparent reason, sentences are omitted.

Page 772: 'Les Hébreux s'avouaient eux-mêmes leur infériorité vis-à-vis de l'Egypte' is watered down to 'The Hebrews themselves acknowledged some sort of dependency upon Egypt.'

Page 779: 'Sa grand'mère, Maâkah, adorait un ashérah chez elle: il abattit l'emblème à coups de hache, le brûla dans la vallée du Cédron, et destitua l'aïeule du rang suprême qu'elle occupait au harem depuis trois générations,' is translated 'His grandmother, Maachah, had made an abominable image for an asherah; he cut it down and burnt it in the valley of the Kedron and deposed her from the supremacy in the royal household which she had held for three generations.' The supremacy of a household is not in the very slightest degree the same thing as the supremacy of a harim, and moreover gives an entirely inaccurate sense to the sentence.

Page 780, note 1, reads 'chiffre traditionnel,' which is altered to 'Bible figures.'

Page 785: 'Un personnage de cette envergure devait être supérieur aux lois ordinaires de l'humanité: Elie vivant fut ravi au ciel sur un char de feu. La tradition le veut ainsi et l'on voit, par son exagération même, quelle impression terrible le grand prophète avait laissée sur l'esprit de son temps.' This passes, by skilful manipulation, into 'The sacred writings go on to tell us that the prophet who had held such close converse with the Deity was exempt from the ordinary law of humanity and was carried to heaven in a chariot of fire. The account that has come down to us shows the impression of awe left by Elijah on the spirit of his age.'

The dispassionate reader must at once see under what disadvantages the English edition of *Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples* labours; for, laying aside the passages where apparently deliberate alterations have been made, he will see, besides, the unintentional blunders and inaccuracies which occur in places where there is absolutely no reason for touching the text, and where we feel sure that the publishers cannot have had the slightest desire to do so.

We
'pretend
form no
that sli
tive' or
many p
understo
very diff
we coul
put the

It is
condemn
per se an
tional in
blunder
crime.

M. H
not exer
must ha
bringing
tion of i
first-clas
Professor
self have
have sele
by which
English
script or
submitte
he never
plea of v
either pu
omission
carelessn
to delay
The Stru
not redo

It is
compelle
society, t
work. H
which co
themselv
end, and
exposure

VOL. X

We regret to see that terms of disparagement such as 'pretend' and 'imagined' are introduced gratuitously. They form no part of the text, and we would indicate to the reader that slight verbal discrepancies such as substituting 'narrative' or 'sacred writings' for 'la tradition' run throughout many pages of the book. 'Rédacteur' is invariably misunderstood—'a redactor' and 'the writer' of a MS. are two very different people. There are many more mistakes which we could point out, but these will probably be sufficient to put the reader on his guard.

It is with the profoundest regret that we are obliged to condemn *The Struggle of the Nations*, both as a translation *per se* and also on account of its unacknowledged but intentional inaccuracies. The Society, though meaning well, has blundered; and to many minds a blunder is worse than a crime.

M. Hachette et Cie, Professor Maspero's publishers, are not exempt from blame in the matter. Knowing, as they must have done, the nature of the work which they were bringing out, why did they negotiate for the English translation of it with a Society like the S.P.C.K., instead of with a first-class firm of publishers? Being well acquainted with Professor Maspero's views, we feel sure that he cannot himself have had a free hand in this matter, or he would never have selected a distinctly orthodox Society to be the channel by which his critical history of the past was to be known to English readers. It seems to us impossible that the manuscript or proof-sheets of the English edition can have been submitted to the learned author; for we feel convinced that he never for one moment would have sanctioned them. No plea of want of time or any such like excuse could justify either publisher or translator in such an omission—if such an omission there has been. The whole book, by its manifest carelessness, betrays haste, and it would have been far better to delay the publication of both editions than to have issued *The Struggle of the Nations*, which in its present form does not redound to the credit of either translator or publishers.

It is with the most unfeigned distress we find ourselves compelled to use such harsh language about this venerable society, to which the Church is indebted for so much valuable work. But the attempt to adapt Maspero's views to those which commend themselves to persons who cannot bring themselves into line with the Higher Critics was bound to end, and, indeed, deserved to end, in discomfiture and exposure.

SHORT NOTICES.

Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy. By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

EACH fresh instalment of Dr. Liddon's works increases our sense of the loss which the Church on earth sustained by his departure, and on the present occasion we are also deeply conscious of the value of the strong wisdom of the Warden of Keble, whose death is a serious blow to the small company of Dr. Liddon's literary executors. There are, happily, many persons who do not need to be told what Dr. Liddon's explanatory analyses of Holy Scripture are like. Those who attended his lectures when he was an Oxford professor, or who enjoyed the informal classes which he used to hold on Sunday evening, or into whose hands the analyses have already fallen, whether when privately printed and circulated among his pupils or when published, as in the case of the Epistle to the Romans, know full well how the clearness and range of these terse comments opened an entirely new view of the richness of St. Paul's language to all but a very small minority of men. This is especially the case with this, the first of the Pastoral Epistles. We may have thought that the little cluster of pastoral remarks which St. Paul sent for the guidance of St. Timothy was but a small bunch upon the sacred vine. But when Dr. Liddon presses the words we see how fruitfully they yield what truly maketh glad the heart of man. The main questions which arise almost all turn on the authenticity of the Pastoral group.¹ The external evidence does not fall within the scope of an explanatory analysis, but the rejection of the Pastoral Epistles by some leading Gnostic teachers is intimately bound up with the internal evidence of current forms of false teaching, and on this last point Dr. Liddon has much to say (e.g. on p. 40), for the passages which allude to the contemporary heretics are numerous. Not less numerous, and even more important, are those passages which justify the statements of the preface to the Ordinal. As might be expected, Dr. Liddon is clear enough as to the import of St. Paul's teaching on the Christian ministry (pp. 21-23). We wish that his literary executors had printed as an introductory note to this analysis the learned essay on Holy Orders which was prefixed to the second edition of Dr. Liddon's sermon on 'A Father in Christ,' if only to atone for their mistake in omitting it from the volume in which they inserted that sermon.² We must pass by other leading topics in the Pastoral group, such as the relation of the events recorded to the history of St. Paul, the evidence for a second imprisonment, and the special style of the group, because we desire to notice the chief passages in the first Epistle of the group, upon which Dr. Liddon has the fullest and most interesting remarks. The student who

¹ *Notes on the Study of St. Paul's Epistles.* By the Rev. A. C. Headlam (Blackwell, Oxford, 1891), p. 14.

² *Clerical Life and Work*, p. 288.

wishes
consul
expla
vation
prover
words
upon
secured
Mother
married
honour
(pp. 32
is not
subject
Testam
form, p
begotte
note on
and the
the ecc
are full
that U
consulte
παράθε
from his
conclud
ordinati
masterly

Sermons
D.I
(Lo
1897

As the y
more to
with the
example,
1870, an
sixteen h
Lent cou
useful pu
another v
and it als
sermons
Dr. Lidd
his subject
Oxford w
Penitent

wishes to see how the ground is mapped out will do well to begin by consulting the summary analysis, which is placed in front of the explanatory portion. Then will come the perusal of the fine observations on the salutation of the Epistle (p. 2), the remarks on the proverbial sayings current in the Church (pp. 6, 23), and the different words employed to designate prayer (p. 10). The famous passage upon 'the Childbearing' is interpreted of 'the ennobling blessing secured to all Christian women through Christ's birth of a human Mother' (p. 19); 'the husband of one wife' is taken to mean 'having married, if at all, only once' (pp. 24, 26-8); 'a good degree' is 'an honourable step in the ministry of the Church, viz. the presbyterate' (pp. 32, 34); the vexed question of the reading in 1 St. Tim. iii. 16 is not one which really affects the sense, for 'the pre-existence of the subject of' this early Christian hymn 'lies in ἐφανερώθη. The New Testament knows of only One Being Who was manifested in human form, preached among the heathen, taken up in glory—the Only-begotten Son' (pp. 37-8). No one, we trust, will omit to study the note on the grace which St. Timothy received, its nature and origin, and the attestation of its reality (pp. 47-8). The observations on the ecclesiastical order of widows (p. 55), and on slavery (pp. 70-72), are full of information concerning the early Church, but we regret that Uhlhorn¹ was not mentioned among the authors who may be consulted on the slavery of the ancient world. Naturally, upon παραθήκην Dr. Liddon refers to St. Vincent, and quotes a fine passage from him in his note on the deposit of the faith (pp. 91-2). We may conclude with an earnest hope that many bishops will cause their ordination candidates and their young deacons to prepare this very masterly analysis, with its splendid notes, for a searching examination.

Sermons preached on Special Occasions, 1860-1889. By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

As the years passed by Dr. Liddon confined his sermons more and more to the great dome which is for so many men chiefly associated with the memory of his voice. There are sixteen sermons, for example, in this volume, and only six of them were preached since 1870, and three of these were delivered in St. Paul's. Many of the sixteen have been issued separately, and some appeared in the Oxford Lent courses of sermons arranged by Bishop Wilberforce. Two useful purposes, at least, are fulfilled by the collection. It adds another volume to the uniform set of Dr. Liddon's printed works, and it also illustrates different periods of his style. The titles of the sermons will recall them to many who heard them, for it was one of Dr. Liddon's special gifts to be able to select a title which included his subject and excluded all else. The Lent sermons preached at Oxford which appear in this volume are: 'Christ's Welcome to the Penitent' (p. 1), 'The Enduring Conflict of Christ with Undue

¹ *The Conflict of Christianity*, pp. 131 ff.

Exaltation of Intellect' (p. 96), 'The Victor in the Times of Preparation' (p. 117), 'Personal Responsibility for the Gift of Revelation' (p. 138), 'Jonah' (p. 164), and 'Noah' (p. 243). The only 'University' sermon, and that preached at Cambridge, is 'Devotion to the Church of Christ' (p. 320). At St. Paul's there were four: 'Profit and Loss' (p. 75), preached at a special evening service in 1865; 'The One Salvation' (p. 267), on behalf of the Bishop of London's Fund in 1873; 'Teaching and Healing' (p. 304), before the International Medical Congress in 1881; and 'Religion and Arms' (p. 342), before the London Rifle Brigade in 1889—a sermon which will provide wholesome teaching for the growing companies of the Church Lads' Brigade. The other sermons, all preached in London, are: 'The Aim and Principles of Church Missions' (p. 26), on behalf of St. George's Mission in East London; 'Active Love a Criterion of Spiritual Life' (p. 52), for the Church Penitentiary Association; 'A Sister's Work' (p. 193), preached in substance at All Saints', Margaret Street; 'Christ and Education' (p. 220), at St. James's, Piccadilly; and 'Love and Knowledge' (p. 286), in the chapel of King's College. It is not necessary to say more of the quality of these sermons than that every one of them deserves to find a permanent place in the collected sermons of the great preacher. We think that it may be of interest to our readers to mention that the sermon on Noah, which appears in this volume, was once described by one who had heard all the great University preachers at Oxford for more than thirty years, as one of the greatest sermons that he had ever heard. We would fain drive home to preachers the precious lesson to be derived from the fact that Dr. Liddon's sermons were so well prepared as to be complete discourses. It is hardly ever possible, after reading a sermon of his, to ask why he omitted to notice this remarkable passage of Scripture, or why he failed to allude to that most pertinent historical illustration, for he placed in each part of his discourse what ought to be found there with the hand of a master, alike in the fields of Scripture and of general culture. The account of hospitals in the early Church (p. 210) is a fine instance of this finished work. When we compare the earlier with the later discourses we think that we are able to trace certain differences between them in this and other volumes of Dr. Liddon's sermons. The eloquence bursts out more spontaneously in the later sermons; in the earlier we find many a sentence which seems to suggest that a consummate artist has spared no pains to bring it to the highest exactitude and perfection. One is the flow of a grand stream, the other is the result of the sculptor's chisel; one is nature, the other is art. In his later discourses also we have often thought, and it is very likely that the point has been noticed by others, that Dr. Liddon allowed a certain triumphant freedom of play to his fine gifts of irony and humour, which he kept under more severe control, or which were, perhaps, less developed, in his earlier years, but which, in their maturity, resembled the tone of the passages in the Psalter which describe the idols of the heathen more than anything else with which we can compare them. The skill of division,

surely
have
for p
belon
comm
expo
who
his r
passa
the
porti
(p. 7
man
comm
confi
rever

The

THE
treat
Acco
life
dict
the
opin
Guar
on th
Lect
corre
adhe
adde
appe
sion
Theo
late
chara
mani
unsu
auth
as he

Rev.
Revie
2

surely one of the greatest gifts of a preacher, naturally seems also to have developed by use, and makes the later sermons better models for preachers than the earlier ones. There is one more characteristic belonging to all Dr. Liddon's sermons which has often led us to commend them to young men. It is that they contain such valuable expositions of Holy Scripture. We are never tired of saying that he who possesses a complete edition of Dr. Liddon's sermons has within his reach one of the very finest commentaries on the most important passages of the Bible which can be obtained, alike for insight into the characters of the sacred history and the meaning of difficult portions of the text. For example, the sermon on 'Profit and Loss' (p. 75) is really a very full exposition of our Lord's words, 'What is a man profited?' And the sermon on Jonah (p. 164) is, in fact, a commentary upon the history of Jonah.¹ The present sermons confirm us in our opinions, and increase our gratitude to their revered author.

The Church of the Sixth Century. Six Chapters in Ecclesiastical History. By WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D., Birkbeck Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History, Trinity College, Cambridge; Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ely. With Illustrations. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

THE most noticeable point in this clever book is Mr. Hutton's treatment of the supposed unorthodoxy of the Emperor Justinian. According to the opinion usually held, Justinian at the end of his life lapsed into the heresy of the Aphthartodocetics, published an edict declaring this notion to be orthodox, and deposed Eutychius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, for his resistance to the edict. This opinion was challenged by Mr. Hutton in an article published in the *Guardian* six years ago,² and there has since been some controversy on the subject between himself and Professor Bury. In the Birkbeck Lectures of 1896, published 'with only a few verbal changes and corrections' (Preface, p. xiii) in the present work, Mr. Hutton adhered to and developed what he had previously said; and he has added an Appendix in reply to an article by Professor Bury, which appeared in the *Guardian* early in this year.³ In his careful discussion of this subject Mr. Hutton puts aside the testimony of Theophanes and Nicephorus, Glycas and Cedrenus, as being too late to be of value; that of Eustathius because of the general character of his *Life of Eutychius*, which he describes as 'full of manifest fables and inaccuracies,' and as 'a book which, when unsupported by other evidence,' cannot be accepted 'as a valid authority' (p. 214); and that of Evagrius because, valuable authority as he is, 'he is inaccurate in many points,' and is likely to have been

¹ A striking parallel to the moral history of Jonah is related of the Rev. J. J. Enmegahbowk, an Indian clergyman, in *The American Church Review* for October 1885, p. 546.

² *Guardian*, April 12, 1891.

³ *Ibid.* January 13, 1897.

'misinformed' in a matter of this kind (pp. 219-20). He contends that the letter of Nicetius of Trier, while it accuses Justinian of heresy, is inconsistent with a belief on the part of the writer that he was an Aphthartodocetic, since the charge is that the Emperor made our Lord to be 'mere man.' On the other hand, Mr. Hutton points out Justinian's long acquaintance with, and previous condemnation of, the Aphthartodocetic heresy, and the high estimation in which he continued to be held throughout the Church. The whole discussion, if not altogether convincing, is learned and temperate, and Mr. Hutton sums up his position in the following passage:

'In spite, then, of the consensus of historians, I plead for a re-opening of the question, and I still claim that we cannot state on purely historical grounds that Justinian became an Aphthartodocete. . . . I think it cannot be denied that the general judgment of later ages was that he was orthodox. I do not think the evidence for the prosecution is strong enough to obtain a conviction. . . . One possible explanation of the difficulty may be tentatively suggested. Aphthartodocetism in some of its aspects was not far removed from orthodox belief. While Julian of Halicarnassus affirmed that the Body of Christ was incorruptible, and from this his opponents drew the inference that the Humanity was unreal, his opponent Severus regarded the Lord's Body as subject to the general laws of corruptibility, which affect all material substances, but subject only to these natural conditions when and as He willed. Neither asserted that the Body of the Lord had seen corruption; but the one asserted very strongly a doctrine which would destroy the reality of the Incarnation. Justinian may have seemed—from some writing, perhaps, which we have lost—to approach too near to the opinion of Severus. Exaggerated reports may have been spread, and distant bishops have taken alarm. Nicetius, ignorant as his letter would seem clearly to show that he was, would appeal to his "honoured lord, the dear Justinian," to remove the reproach which, after all, may never have been deserved. Be that as it may, I must be content to leave the question, as I believe, unsolved. I do not believe that we have yet full proof either way; but if that proof ever comes, I should be more surprised to find that it made certain the heresy than that it confirmed the orthodoxy of the greatest Greek theologian of the sixth century' (pp. 237-40).

In the Appendix Mr. Hutton quotes at length the passage from John, the Jacobite Bishop of Nikiusi, which Professor Bury cited in the article in the *Guardian* which we have mentioned. He expresses his opinion with regard to it thus:

'If I understand the passage aright, it asserts that Eutychius declared that our Lord's body before His crucifixion was incorruptible, and that Justinian held that "He was Man like as we are," and that "the Holy Scriptures affirmed that He has suffered for us in His body." Surely this . . . is to state that Eutychius was an Aphthartodocete, and that Justinian was orthodox. The subject is confusing enough, but I can see no other meaning in the passage from John of Nikiu. . . . M. Zotenberg has pointed out . . . that John does not seem to have a clear conception of the theological question, and that the writing of Menas mentioned is apocryphal. Nor does the statement which he attributes to Justinian agree with the opinions of Julian of Halicarnassus. . . . John . . . himself a heretic . . . uses language which seems to show the Emperor to be orthodox' (pp. 308-9).

The
siderati
'opinio
state of
generall
Justinia
positive
some su

We
most no
that the
and use
history
sixth ce
love of
to shar
division
as a ru
admirab
the boo

Tha
treatme
some of

'The
is an ag
of missi
great m
the Emp
of the L
of Engli

Some P
in
Ma
Joh

THIS is
greater
1896.

Church
Parliam
seemed

'a favor
aspects
attempt
educatio

The
Mr. Car
from be
knowle
formatio

Though we doubt whether Mr. Hutton gives sufficient consideration to the statement of John, 'L'empereur inclinait vers l'opinion de Julien,' we agree with him as to the apparently confused state of mind indicated by that writer's language. On the point generally he has hardly made out a strong case for the orthodoxy of Justinian; but he has shown reason for hesitation in accepting the positive statements about his heresy which have been usual, and for some such tentative position as that for which he himself pleads.

We have called the point with which we have been dealing the most noticeable which the book contains. It must not be supposed that there is nothing else of interest. The whole work is fascinating and useful. There is much of theological value. The treatment of history is full of insight and power. The chapter on 'the art of the sixth century' is altogether delightful. Occasionally Mr. Hutton's love of clearness and epigram may, in our judgment, lead him unduly to sharpen a point, as in the language which he uses about the divisions between the East and the West before the year 519; but, as a rule, his judgment is well under control, and his language admirably calculated to convey a true idea of facts. The utility of the book is increased by the illustrations.

That the sixth century is worthy of close attention and separate treatment can hardly be denied. Mr. Hutton has well described some of its special features in his opening sentences:

'The sixth century is one of the great ages of the world's history. It is an age of great soldiers and great statesmen, of lawyers and historians, of missionaries and saints. It is an age of great events as well as of great men. It saw the ruin of the East Gothic power, the restoration of the Empire to almost its widest boundaries, the invasion and settlement of the Lombards, the foundation of the mediæval Papacy, the beginnings of English Christianity' (p. 3).

Some Principles of Religious Education. Four Addresses delivered in Worcester Cathedral. By WILLIAM H. CARNEGIE, B.A., Magdalen College, Oxford; Rector of Great Witley. (London: John Murray, 1896.)

THIS is a strong book. The four addresses which comprise the greater part of it were delivered in Worcester Cathedral in Lent 1896. At that time, as Mr. Carnegie mentions in his preface, Churchmen were awaiting with keen interest the introduction into Parliament of the Education Bill of that year, and he seized what seemed to be

'a favourable opportunity for discussing one or two of the deeper aspects of the questions to which' the Bill was 'relative, and for attempting to make a slight contribution to the theory of religious education' (Preface, p. v).

The addresses contain clear statements of valuable principles. Mr. Carnegie insists strongly that the true object of education, far from being the mere imparting of a certain amount of technical knowledge, is the development of capacity, and consequently the formation of character. If that is so, it is impossible for any system of

education which is without a religious element to do its work. And he mentions 'three chief reasons' because of which religion must be regarded as an 'absolutely essential element in any true system of education.'

'1. We regard it as essential because religious truth and so-called secular truth have such important bearings on each other that it is impossible to study them apart without inflicting serious injury on both. Both religious knowledge and secular knowledge acquired under such conditions will be warped and one-sided and incomplete, for they will each lack the necessary service which the other supplies. Religious knowledge will be detached from the world of human speculation and experience and endeavour, in which it should ever seek to find its expression and application. Secular knowledge will be deprived of that background of the supernatural and the infinite on which alone its different parts can be viewed in their true perspective and combined in the unity of an intelligible whole.

'2. We regard it as essential because any true system of education must include moral training as well as intellectual cultivation . . . and this end cannot be accomplished without the aid of religion. . . .

'3. We regard it as essential because religion has a value of its own apart from its application to the exigencies of temporal existence. Because that world of the supernatural and the eternal to whose threshold conscience brings us is the true home of man's highest self; and because, if he is to live his true life, and to accomplish the true destiny for which he was created, he must even here begin to breathe the atmosphere of that world, and sedulously to cultivate those habits and aspirations and modes of thought and feeling which are congenial to it' (pp. 60-63).

These lines of thought are developed with much robustness and force, and the consideration of them leads Mr. Carnegie, without formulating any detailed policy, to lay down two conditions as essential to any sound system of Christian education.

'These two conditions are—

'1. That religion shall be taught by religious teachers; by men and women who believe in what they teach, and who are trying to conform their lives to its claims.

'2. That the religious truth which we shall make use of for educational purposes shall be un mutilated truth, and the religious knowledge we seek to impart, un mutilated knowledge' (p. 69).

We are disposed to regard the Introduction as in some respects the most important part of the book. Mr. Carnegie there points out that the question about religious education is only 'one aspect' of the 'much larger question' 'what part religion is to play in our civilized progress' (p. xiii), and he calls attention to some features of the present time which a good many Church people are content to ignore.

'Religion has ceased to exercise any influence over the lives of large masses of our fellow-countrymen because they have ceased to regard it as practical or necessary' (pp. xxii-xxiii).

'If those who adopt this attitude were merely the profligate and the careless, it would not be such a serious matter; their indifference could easily be explained on other grounds. But the case is far different:

among
intell
prise
are c
too, w
have
affect
are th

aban
ends
they
Chris
being
it. E
expre
to sh
practi
disreg
be inc
and is

M
he ha
state
He h
or m
views
are co
in pr
it may

The C

V

K

THIS

'The

State,

tinuit

'Unit

Holy

expre

gregat

may b

They

if the

TI

Churc

there

'T

accor

who i

power

among their ranks is to be found a great proportion of the industry and intelligence of our race; men who are foremost in every kind of enterprise; serious men and sober men, who have a settled purpose in life, and are capable of concentrating their energies on its accomplishment. Men, too, who maintain on the whole a high standard of rectitude; who often have a keen sense of honour; who are not lacking in sympathy and affection; good fathers, loyal citizens, successful men of business. These are the men who are moulding our civilization' (pp. xxiii-xxiv).

'The great majority of our fellow-countrymen have practically abandoned Christianity, because they believe they can accomplish the ends of life without its aid. It is our duty to bring home to them that they are mistaken. We believe that they are: we believe that Christianity is absolutely essential to happiness and progress and well-being; that society has no stability, and morality no security, apart from it. But it is no longer enough merely to believe this, nor even to express our belief in the form of practical endeavour. We must be able to show hard-headed men of the world that religion has for them a practical value of the most important kind; that any system of life which disregards it is essentially incomplete; that any morality which seeks to be independent of it is but living on the capital which it has provided, and is doomed to ultimate bankruptcy' (pp. xxv-xxvi).

Mr. Carnegie has, among others, three qualifications for the task he has undertaken in this book. He has honestly faced the existing state of things in England. He understands what education means. He has a true idea of the Christian Faith. It is the absence of one or more of these qualifications which leads to the unsatisfactory views about education generally and the place of religion in it which are common among Church people. This book is likely to be useful in promoting the growth of sounder opinions, and we cordially wish it may have a wide circulation.

The Catholic Revival, and other Sermons. Preached in St. Ninian's, Whitby. By the Rev. ARTHUR P. LOXLEY, M.A., Priest-in-charge. (Oxford and London: Mowbray and Co., not dated.)

This volume contains fourteen Sermons, the subjects of which are 'The Catholic Revival,' 'Sacerdotalism,' 'Ritualism,' 'Church and State,' 'The Church—One,' 'Holy,' 'Catholic,' 'Apostolic,' 'Continuity of the Church of England,' 'The Thirty-Nine Articles,' 'Unity of Christendom' (two sermons), 'The Papacy,' and 'The Holy Eastern Church.' They are marked by vigour of thought and expression, and are likely to have been useful in instructing the congregation to which they were addressed in the Catholic Faith. They may be helpful also to those who read them in their published form. They would, we think, have been more valuable for both purposes if the preacher had given them a less controversial tone.

There is a statement in the Sermon on 'The Continuity of the Church of England' which demands serious protest. Mr. Loxley there says—

'There cannot be two lawful Bishops in the same diocese, and, according to the acknowledged law of the universal Church, the Bishops who intrude into the dioceses of other Bishops have no jurisdiction—no power, that is, to exercise their episcopal functions—and their acts, and

the acts of their clergy, such as Absolution, are regarded as null and void : that means, if you were to go to Confession to a Roman Catholic priest here in Whitby, and he gave you Absolution, his Absolution would not hold good. So far then from its being safer to join the Roman Church, it is far safer to remain in communion with the old historic Church, which has the old Catholic line of Bishops, and which alone in this country represents Christ, or has the authority of Christ' (p. 113).

We are aware that there is a school of thought among ourselves which, grafting the Papal theory of jurisdiction upon Catholic principles, asserts that Absolutions which are irregularly given are absolutely invalid ; and that some adherents of it contend that no Roman Catholic living in England has received a valid Absolution since the Reformation. The theology which underlies this view has dangers for English Churchmanship which are not always sufficiently recognized, and is as inconsistent with the true view of jurisdiction as it is lacking in acknowledgment of the fact that the exact effect produced by irregularities in Church organization or the administration of the Sacraments cannot be rightly considered without attention to the circumstances under which they took place. The whole subject is too complicated for us to enter into within the limits of a short notice, and the opinion against which we protest received a very complete refutation many years ago from the facts stated and arguments used in the course of Dr. Pusey's admirable treatise *The Church of England leaves her Children free to whom to open their griefs*.

Among the many passages in Mr. Loxley's sermons which we have read with much sympathy and appreciation we would instance two in which he emphasizes the truths that 'the unity of the Catholic Church'

'is by no means limited to the baptized here on earth, but takes in all the ten thousand times ten thousand who have finished their course and rest from their labours' (p. 63) ;

and that Christ Himself

'is always and everywhere the true Minister, the true Priest' (pp. 101-2).

The Dies Ire. On this Hymn and its English versions. By the Rev. C. F. S. WARREN, M.A. Part I. The Hymn. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1897.)

This volume contains much interesting and useful matter about the *Dies Ire*. The author set himself to collect the versions of this great hymn, supposing that he would be able to publish the whole of them, with notes, in a large pamphlet. Research showed him the existence of a very large number of versions, and he has been compelled to abandon for the time his plan of publishing a complete collection. The present work contains lists of the versions with which he has been able to meet, an account of the history of the hymn, and painstaking comments and criticisms on the various translations. He hopes that in the future he may be able to supplement this volume by printing at length the whole collection which he has made, and appeals to those who are interested in the subject

to hel
cation
compi
tionar
work
lists in
are ba
certain
compl
Mr
compo
account
no not
works
pleasu
and m
which,
tiarum
by Da

Books

B
J.

THIS l
tations
Jeremy
Serious
Thoug
oddly
of the
his vol
and us
may de
devotic

The
remind
this is
part of

'The
ing sea
from the
less full
of the s
Not ma
the riot
a certain
interrupte
power a
disposed
One val
year thr

to help him to do so by becoming subscribers to this further publication. Those who remember that Mr. Warren helped in the compilation of the lists of translations of the *Dies Ira* in the *Dictionary of Hymnology*, edited by Mr. Julian, will anticipate that his work will be found to be thoroughly done, and a comparison of the lists in the *Dictionary* with those in this book shows that the latter are based upon still fuller materials than the former. There will certainly be reason for regret if he should be unable to publish his complete collection.

Mr. Warren accepts the usual opinion that the *Dies Ira* was composed by Thomas of Celano, and his book contains a brief account of Thomas and his writings. We have lately observed that no notice of the other hymns besides the *Dies Ira* is given in several works in which we might well expect to find it, and it has been a pleasure to us to find that Mr. Warren has not overlooked this point, and mentions a few details about the 'two Franciscan Sequences' which, together with the *Dies Ira*, are 'found in the *Index Sequentialium* of Joachim Brander of St. Gall, 1507,' and were both 'printed by Daniel in the *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*.'

Books that Help the Religious Life. By the Rev. H. M. B. REID, B.D., Author of *Lost Habits of the Religious Life*. (Edinburgh: J. Gardner Hitt, 1897.)

THIS little book consists of summarized accounts, with some quotations, of the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, the *Imitation of Christ*, Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*, *Paradise Lost*, Law's *Serious Call*, Baxter's *Saints' Everlasting Rest*, Young's *Night Thoughts*, and the *Christian Year*. The selection strikes us as rather oddly made, but there is no doubt about the sympathetic character of the author's treatment of the books which he has selected, and his volume may form a very useful introduction to the study and use of them. We hope that the inclusion of Law's *Serious Call* may do something to extend the knowledge of that really valuable devotional work.

There is rarely anything in Mr. Reid's thought or language to remind readers that he is a Presbyterian, and in a passage where this is implied he bears testimony to the practical usefulness of one part of the Church's system. In the last of the sketches he writes—

'The *Christian Year* is an attempt to link poetical ideas to the passing seasons, natural and religious. Some of these seasons have already, from the religious point of view, become familiar to us, and are more or less fully kept, as, for instance, Christmas and Easter. But the majority of the sacred anniversaries are still unrecognized and even forgotten. Not many ordinary Scotchmen remember that the Sunday which saw the riot in St. Giles' Cathedral, in Edinburgh, on account of the use of a certain liturgy, was the seventh after Trinity; and that the collect interrupted was the fine prayer beginning with the words "Lord of all power and might." . . . A Scotsman bred up in the National Church is disposed to ask, Of what practical use is this series of anniversaries? One valuable end at least is gained. The devout reader is carried every year through the gospel story, and reminded of the fundamental truths

of our Christian faith. . . . Surely, much may be gained from such an orderly course of worship and thought. Keble's poems in the *Christian Year* hang like ripe clusters on the boughs of the calendar. Journeying through the year with him, we find each Sunday adorned with some fitting verse and theme. 'The Lord's Day loses its dull indistinctness' (pp. 115-8).

There are occasional instances of awkward phraseology. The strangest of these is perhaps in the phrases 'among quaint advices to professional men' (p. 47) and 'regarding the Lord's Supper there are many fine advices' (p. 51).

The Belief and Worship of the Anglican Church. With an Explanation of her Teaching and Ritual. By ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL KNOWLES, Author of *The Church and the Greater Sacraments, On Wings of Fancy*, &c. Third edition, revised and enlarged; with an Introduction by the Right Rev. ISAAC LEA NICHOLSON, S.T.D., Bishop of Milwaukee. (London: Charles Taylor, 1896.)

It is a pleasure to notice that this very useful manual, the first edition of which was published in 1894, is the work of a layman. The author tells us himself that he

'has tried not to delve too deeply into the mazes of theological reasoning or philosophical thought, which but serve to confuse the average reader unskilled in the subtle and metaphysical reasoning of the schools, but to present the matter in such a way that it may be so clear as to be readily understood and appreciated by all, and so concise as to be interesting yet instructive' (Preface to first edition, p. xi).

In this attempt he has been eminently successful. The book gives us a clear, easily understood account of the Catholic Faith, of the main principles of Christian worship, of Ritual and Symbolism, and of the Church's Year. The Bishop of Milwaukee in his Introduction wisely says—

'We count his book as all the more valuable, written as it is for the help and guidance of his brother laymen, because so strictly his own, in conception, arrangement, and completion; and because his language is often so untechnical, his illustrations so close at hand, drawn from the ordinary run of practical life from day to day' (pp. vii-viii).

Yet we wish the author had submitted the proofs of the book to some one with fuller theological and historical knowledge than he himself possesses. There are a number of statements on points of detail to which, with little loss of shortness or clearness, greater accuracy could have been given. It is hardly right to speak of the final clauses of the Nicene Creed as having been 'added' 'at the Council of Constantinople, 381 A.D.' (p. 11), without any indication of the very great doubt which many competent authorities feel on that point. To speak of the 'very strong evidence' 'to support the claim that St. Paul' 'evangelized' (p. 18) Britain would not be possible to any one who had examined the original authorities which have been represented as supplying the testimony. It is not the case that the

'Six
(pp. 2
the 'v
fall wi
reign
(p. 26)
doubt
(p. 64)
munio
the Eu
Cranm
cation
an unf
'confi
by his
Churc
bility
these
been u
his bo
saved
W
but be
to do
faults
Tw
for th
Nyass
W
good
Churc
The L
S
H
d
1

THIS
Book.
various
in a
clergy
and t
service
Th
judgm
the be
statem
Prayer
loud v

'Six Articles' of the reign of Henry VIII. 'never went into effect' (pp. 24-5). We do not know what is meant by the statement that the 'validity' of the 'consecration' of Cardinal Pole must hang or fall with that of Parker (p. 25). It is not accurate to say that the reign of James I. 'virtually ends the work of the Reformation' (p. 26). It could not be seriously argued that 'there is very little doubt that' the Apostles' Creed 'was composed in the first century' (p. 64). It is not fair to say that 'members of the Roman Communion must believe that nothing remains of' the bread and wine in the Eucharist 'except the appearance only' (p. 107), or to mention Cranmer as a believer in the Real Presence (p. 113) without any indication of the various changes his mind underwent on this subject. It is an unfortunate expression that Confirmation, '*as its meaning tells us,*' 'confirms the vows of the Christian made by him or made for him by his sponsors in Holy Baptism' (p. 129). It is a mistake that the Church of Rome allows divorce (evidently meant to imply the possibility of remarriage) where there has been adultery (p. 156). In these and a few other points Mr. Knowles appears to us to have been misled by writers whose works he has used, and if he had shown his book before publication to some competent critic he might have saved it from being marked by these blemishes.

We have made these remarks, not in any spirit of hypercriticism, but because we like the manual so much, and think it so well fitted to do a most useful work, that we regret it should not be free from faults such as those we have mentioned.

Two odd misprints have caught our eyes—the spelling Gibbons for the name of the great historian (pp. 7-8) and St. Gregory Nyassa for that of the theologian of the fourth century (p. 249).

We should add that there is an excellent table of contents and a good index, and that the author is a member of the American Church.

The Layman's Introduction to the Book of Common Prayer, being a Short History of its Development. By the Rev. EDWIN H. ELAND, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford. With facsimile. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

THIS is a clear and careful account of the history of the Prayer Book. The writer brings out the chief points of importance in the various revisions which the Book has undergone, and puts his readers in a position to use it intelligently. We think that some of the clergy, as well as of the laity, will find Mr. Eland's little treatise useful, and that, with a certain amount of supplementing, it may be of service to those who are preparing for examination for ordination.

There are a few points in which slight alterations would, in our judgment, be an improvement in the second edition which we hope the book will reach. Among these we may mention the following: The statement on p. 60 was apparently written in forgetfulness that the Prayer Book of 1549 ordered the Lord's Prayer to be said 'with a loud voice.' There is no notice on p. 63 of the special position

in which the Invocation of the Holy Spirit was placed in 1549, or on pp. 68-9 of the rubric directing the vestments of the priest at the Holy Communion in the same Book. On p. 142, while it is stated that the Creed submitted to the Council of Nicea by Eusebius of Cæsarea declared 'the Godhead of Jesus Christ' 'in emphatic terms similar to those which ultimately were adopted by the Council,' the absence of the word *homoousios* from that Creed is not mentioned. The change in the method of the use of the *Quicumque vult*, which was due to the revisers of 1661, is ignored on p. 148. And the phrase 'appropriated only by faith' on p. 166 might easily mislead.

We have been pleased to observe a clear statement of the true explanation of the word 'Collect.'

'The name is derived from the Church-Latin word *collecta*, which meant the assembly of worshippers gathered together to hear Mass. Hence in the old Sacramentaries we have the expression, *oratio ad collectam*, meaning "the prayer at the assembly"—a prayer offered at a particular church just before the congregation moved in procession to the so-called "station-church," at which the Mass was really to be celebrated. This expression is soon shortened to *ad collectam*, still meaning the prayer at the assembly; and so, by a very natural transition, the first prayer of the Mass, preceding the Epistle, came to be called the *collecta*, or "collect" (p. 126).

Lectures on Ecclesiastical History delivered in Norwich Cathedral.

With Preface by the Very Reverend the DEAN of NORWICH.
(London: James Nisbet and Co., Limited, 1896.)

WE have read with a great deal of sympathy the preface which the Dean of Norwich has written to these lectures. In it he describes the agreement among Churchmen as to the office of Cathedrals, and refers to parts of his own work at Norwich:

'Churchmen of all schools of thought are in the main agreed in expecting the mother church of each diocese to represent, adequately and completely, the standard to which devotional worship may attain. There the service of song reaches its highest expression. There the Psalter flows in praise, and has flowed in praise for centuries, with the regularity of the tides of the ocean. There the voices of holy and humble men of heart, belonging both to the East and West, are heard day by day, agelong in their language, yet interpreting the needs of the hour. There the Word of Life is read and expounded. There the Sacrament of Initiation and the Sacrament of Sustenance are administered. Thus Cathedral worship, devotional, continuous, and heaving with song, is the expression of the Church's praise. . . . Cathedrals have other functions to fulfil. . . . And, possibly, of all branches of sacred service recognized and encouraged by the Cathedrals of England, it may be questioned if there is one more important than that represented by the Nave Services for the people. . . . The lectures contained in this volume represent one section of a programme which is being wrought out in faith, in patience, in hope. They are historical, and therefore they are educational. The theme is ecclesiastical history, and it is treated in connection with the leaders of thought and of action who lived and laboured in the primitive or sub-apostolic period, and on through the succeeding centuries, closing with the epoch-marking era of St. Augustine' (Preface, pp. v-viii).

T
and
Alexa
learn
misses
as wh
lectur
Clem
great
Mr. F
ness
ledge
acqu
and
Mr. F
ness
but h
'P
recogn
though
accep
said to
there
and th

A
Euseb
and h
which
Incar
centu
sense,
read v
'O
Lord
that c
'T
only
abstra
this, a
Euseb
while
at Nic

D
St. At
that g
ment
we w
senter
'A
the Cr

The lectures which the volume contains are by different authors, and are of very various degrees of merit. That on Clement of Alexandria, contributed by Dr. Chase, is brilliant, accurate, and learned. If here and there there are points that seem to have been missed, or matters we could have wished slightly differently treated, as when, in comparing Greek with Latin theology (pp. 279-280), the lecturer does not sufficiently allow for the inadequate character of Clement's doctrine of sin, we have found the perusal of the lecture a great pleasure, and we think it calculated to be of much usefulness. Mr. Brooke's treatment of Origen bears the marks of the indebtedness to the writings of Bishop Westcott which the author acknowledges; but it will be read with interest even by those well acquainted with what the Bishop has written on the same subject, and among its good points is that of clear and vivid statement. Mr. Brooke is full of enthusiasm for Origen and for the suggestiveness of his writings in their bearing on problems of modern thought; but he is not afraid also to recognize failings, as when he says—

'However wild some of his speculations may seem, he accepted the recognized creed on the authority of the Church; he deduced, as he thought, all his system from the teaching of Holy Scripture. He accepted the same authorities which we acknowledge. Enough has been said to show the extraordinary boldness and width of his thought. If there is much that we cannot accept, there is much to set us thinking, and thinking on the right lines' (p. 319).

Another valuable lecture is that by Professor Gwatkin on Eusebius of Caesarea. We cannot follow the lecturer in all he says, and he does not seem to us to have an adequate sense of the hold which the Church had on the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation in their essential characteristics before the fourth century. But the lecture is brilliant, sympathetic, full of historical sense, admirably calculated to stimulate thought. And we have read with great satisfaction two passages about St. Athanasius.

'On the main point, Athanasius was beyond all question right. Our Lord claimed to be in the very highest sense the Son of God; and by that claim the Gospel stands or falls' (p. 332).

'The work of the Nicene age was to show that God is not personal only but tripersonal, and that He is a Trinity of love, not a Being of abstract simplicity. The failure of Eusebius is that he could not see this, and it is the glory of Athanasius that he did see it; and this is why Eusebius is remembered as the man that hesitated in the day of battle, while Athanasius towers like a king of men above the wavering fathers at Nicea' (p. 336).

Dr. Ince contributes a clear account of 'the life and times of St. Athanasius,' which lays stress on the most important features of that great father's life and work. It was well, perhaps, that he should mention that the *Quicumque vult* was not written by St. Athanasius; we wish he had abstained from or had differently worded the sentence in which he says—

'Athanasius is not responsible for the so-called damnable clauses of the Creed, which have caused so much distress and perplexity to pious

minds; and it is doubtful whether he would have acquiesced in every expression of the exposition contained in the document' (p. 372).

There is a very able lecture on St. Ambrose by Bishop Barry; a careful account of Tertullian, evidently based on thoughtful study of his writings, by Mr. Schneider, the Vice-Principal of Ridley Hall; a useful description of the catacombs by Mr. Henry Gee; an excellent and sympathetic lecture on St. Jerome by Mr. Drury, the Principal of the Church Missionary College at Islington;¹ and a good and fair, if somewhat thin, description of the life and writings of St. Augustine by Dr. Moule.² When we have said that the lecture on 'the Apology of Aristides' is by Professor Robinson we need hardly add that it is interesting, accurate, and powerful, while the concluding paragraph shows that the lecturer was not unmindful of the practical services which such lectures can add to instruction.

'Two lessons stand out clearly for us of to-day as we read the old words of Aristides the philosopher of Athens. One is for the Christian student. He may learn that now as then the comparative study of religion proves Christianity to be supreme and final, because it alone has power to satisfy the needs which all other religions but reveal and deepen. The other is for the Christian man, whether learned or simple. He has it in his power—nay more, the solemn duty lies upon him—to give the highest, most convincing witness of the truth of the religion which he professes, in the quiet, unobtrusive, yet impressive and unquestionable testimony of a Christ-like life. This argument is never out of date. The point of attack in the battle for the Faith is perpetually shifting. The Apologetics of yesterday are not the Apologetics needed for to-day. But while there are human souls that feel their need of something to lift them out of their own failure and sin, so long will they look earnestly to the man whose life proclaims that he has found the secret of living. And as for ourselves we tremble at the responsibility thus thrown upon us, let us remember, for our strengthening and reassurance, that we do not stand alone, so that Christianity must stand or fall with us. The witness of individual lives is taken up and fulfilled and glorified in the corporate witness of the Catholic Church—that larger, steadier witness, reaching back into the past and forward into the future, before and after the short span of our momentary testimony, the perpetual embodiment and presentation to the world of the Life of Christ by the power of His Holy Spirit' (pp. 50-51).

The remaining lectures are less satisfactory. That by the Dean of Canterbury, entitled 'St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp,' and serving as a general introduction to the series, as well as being specially

¹ Among some details which are open to criticism we may mention that Mr. Drury confuses the postponement of Baptism, which was common in the fourth century, with the error condemned in the Sixteenth Article (p. 451), thinks there are 'no sufficient data to decide' the 'question' about the 'perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord' (p. 460), and asserts dogmatically that 'Lerins sent forth its Patrick' (p. 468).

² Dr. Moule does not seem to appreciate the reasons which led to the common postponement of Baptism in the fourth century (pp. 485-6), and we do not think he understands St. Augustine's teaching about the Church or the Eucharist (see, e.g., pp. 495-6, 501).

concer
and is
the the
'the lif
we are
treatm
and co
Archde
Martyr
of the
Archbi
fessor S
for the
respect
the dist
space o
of the u
'his in
ducing
sacerdot
palatabl
all calcu

¹ See
bishop M

² Th
paragra
says, 'V
doctrine
incredib
scheme,
appeared
system.
Judaizin
of the ch
fact the
circumci
upon Je
uncircum
legalistic
accepted
deacon S
without
became
true cou
Christian
Tertullia
second m
are prie
In Bisho
which A
racter of
it were b
VOL.

concerned with those two fathers, is marred by much false rhetoric, and is lacking in appreciation either of the personal character or of the theology of St. Ignatius. Professor Stanley Leathes's lecture on 'the life and times of Irenæus' scarcely reaches the high level at which we are accustomed to find any work from his pen. Dr. Kingsmill's treatment of 'the life and times of St. Chrysostom' is dull and feeble, and contains serious blunders. The lecture entitled 'Cyprian,' by Archdeacon Sinclair, and that on 'the life and times of Justin Martyr,' by Canon Meyrick, are very unsatisfactory. The only parts of the former which are of any value are the copious quotations from Archbishop Benson, Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Westcott, and Professor Schaff; and it is one of the signs of the lecturer's incompetence for the task which he undertook that he evidently in some important respects misunderstands those whom he quotes. We do not think the distinguished ecclesiastic who devoted his scanty leisure for the space of thirty years to the study of St. Cyprian¹ would have approved of the unhistorical and mischievous statement that

'his influence for evil on Christendom, East and West, by introducing into the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ the hierarchical and sacerdotal principles from his heathen associations, and making them palatable by dressing them in Jewish form, has been absolutely beyond all calculation' (p. 140).²

¹ See p. iv of Mr. A. C. Benson's 'Prefatory Note' to the late Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian: his Life, his Times, his Work*.

² There is an even startling contrast between this passage and a paragraph in Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 40, where the Archbishop says, 'Whence then did this form of Christian thought' (*i.e.* St. Cyprian's doctrine of the Priesthood) 'originate? I see no proof, and to me it is incredible, that he or other Africans should have derived any such scheme, consciously or unconsciously, from Pagan constitutions, which appeared to them all in the light of a purely demoniacal and satanic system. Nor yet is it possible that they inherited them from any Judaizing forms of Christianity. For not only is sacerdotalism not one of the characteristics for which Judaizers are ever reprehended, but in fact the very essence of Judaism lay in looking back to the literal circumcision, the literal passover, the literal centralising of the Church upon Jerusalem. Towards Gentile Priests, towards Levites from the uncircumcision, they had no propension. Neither to heathenism nor to legalistic sects can we trace back the fruitful powerful theory now accepted in Africa.' We have no space to discuss the details of Archdeacon Sinclair's lecture; but we must mention the unfairness of quoting without giving the reference a passage written by Tertullian after he became a Montanist (*De exhortatione castitatis*, 7) as supplying 'the true counterpoise' to his 'direct sacerdotal claims on behalf of the Christian Ministry' (p. 133). In the context of the passage in question Tertullian's argument is that, since priests are forbidden to contract a second marriage after the death of a first wife, and since all Christians are priests, therefore second marriages are unlawful for all Christians. In Bishop Lightfoot's reference to this passage (*Philippians*, pp. 255-6), which Archdeacon Sinclair evidently has in view, the Montanistic character of the treatise and the general line of the argument contained in it were both pointed out.

Canon Meyrick's lecture is not without one or two useful features; but most of it is as weak as it is controversial. When the lecturer says that the 'particulars of' his 'sketch' of a Christian Sunday in the time of St. Justin Martyr 'will be drawn in part from Justin's writings, in part from other sources' (p. 71), we can only suppose that his imagination is one of the 'other sources' referred to. He appears to us to have confused the Eucharist with the Agape, to have mixed up what is known about later times with the practice of the first half of the second century, and in his statement that the congregation went home 'for refreshment' between 'the Ante-lucan Service' and the 'Communion Service' to have introduced an assumption for which there is no evidence whatever.

We regret that such excellent work as characterizes the majority of these lectures should appear in the same volume with some that are not likely to serve any useful purpose.

Village Sermons. By the late F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., sometime Hulsean Professor and Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1897.)

THE simplicity and clearness with which these sermons are expressed will be a surprise to some students of Dr. Hort's work. Underneath their clear expression lies much profound truth. They exhibit the spiritual power and intensity of their author; his insight into character and appreciation of human affection; his grip on the truths of the spiritual relation of the soul to God and the spiritual meaning of Holy Scripture; and a strong sense of the present working of God, the inner meaning of life, and the presence of the risen Lord in the lives of Christians. The first sermon, which is entitled 'The Anointing of the Spirit to Preach Freedom and Light,' has some special personal interest as being the first sermon preached by Dr. Hort in his parish of St. Ippolyts and Great Wymondley, in Hertfordshire, on his appointment as vicar in 1857. The following four sermons form an interesting series on Psalm lxxvii. There is one sermon on the Parable of the Sower; then come three sermons on the Temptation of our Lord, one on 'God's love shown in Christ's death,' one on 'the lively hope proceeding from the Resurrection,' one on 'Andrew's discovery of the Christ to himself and Peter;' and the volume is completed by a set of twelve sermons on the spiritual lessons to be derived from the various books of the Bible. The whole of it is likely to prove valuable as suggestive of helpful spiritual truths, and as promoting the devotional use of Holy Scripture. It has a pathetic interest in its indications of the love for the teaching of the Bible which is shown to have marked the scholar who laboured so devotedly at the text of the New Testament. One specially useful part of it is in the practical lessons drawn from the Temptation of Christ; and we may quote from the third sermon of this series two passages which illustrate the preacher's pastoral care.

'This then, brethren, is the story of our Lord's Temptation. These

are
bring
let us
before

'I
confir
have
that y
do wi
of tha
for lif
for lif
consid
throw
Confir
is bro
once n

'C
It can
tion;
But L
momem
fear of
be a ti

If
reason
us fro
thanki
brief '
attenti
and 't

The Sa
B
R

MR. A
study a
historia
disting
of their
to whic
and wh
these a
St. Aug
in the s
ple (p.
(p. 304)
Castle
Church
at Cant
(p. 365)
curate

are the lessons which it reads us year by year when Lent returns and brings back to our thoughts those forty days in the wilderness. Now let us think what it has to say to us at this moment, on this last Sunday before the Confirmation.

'I am not speaking only to those who are themselves about to be confirmed. I am speaking to all. With many of you years and years have passed since you were confirmed: perhaps your present feeling is that you have got that over long ago, and that you have nothing more to do with it now. If so, none have greater need than you to be reminded of that almost forgotten day. The promises you made then were made for life. The gift of God's Spirit bestowed on you then was bestowed for life. If you find your present life unsatisfying, hopeless, weary, consider whether part at least of the reason may not be that you have thrown away the medicine for these ills which the recollection of your Confirmation might have supplied to you. Be thankful then now that it is brought freshly to your mind, and seize the opportunity for beginning once more the way of peace which you have long forsaken' (pp. 96-7).

'Confirmation must always have Lenten thoughts belonging to it. It can never be separated from the recollection and the dread of temptation; it speaks of sins to be repented and enemies to be renounced. But Lent itself is heathenish and not Christian, if it leads us for one moment to forget the coming Easter, if it drowns the hope of life in the fear of death. Much more should Confirmation, with all its solemnity, be a time of faith and hope' (p. 100).

If here and there we have noticed a sentence with which, for one reason or another, we cannot altogether agree, that does not prevent us from highly appreciating these simple, practical sermons, and thanking Dr. Hort's representatives for the publication of them. A brief 'Prefatory Note' by his son, Mr. Arthur Fenton Hort, directs attention to the 'deep and wide theology' which 'underlies them,' and 'the calm and trustful spirit that they reveal' (p. v).

The Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era. First Series.

By the Rev. D. C. O. ADAMS, M.A. With a Preface by the Rev. T. T. CARTER. (Oxford: Mowbray and Co. No date.)

MR. ADAMS has published the fruit of many years of Anglo-Saxon study at a suitable time, and his book will be welcomed both by historians and hagiologists. The inner lives of nearly all the most distinguished saints of the Anglo-Saxon age, and the circumstances of their time are described in interesting little biographical notices, to which reference is made easy by an alphabetical list of names, and which are embellished by some good illustrations. Among these are some of the more striking incidents of the period, such as St. Augustine's approach to Canterbury (frontispiece), Pope Gregory in the Slave Market (p. 6), Coifi's Profanation of the Heathen Temple (p. 75), King Oswald's Cross (p. 90), and St. Cuthbert's Vision (p. 304). Excellent cuts are also given of such places as Bamborough Castle (p. 106), Winchester Cathedral, the font (p. 151), the Saxon Church at Bradford-on-Avon (p. 158), the ruins of St. Augustine's at Canterbury (p. 267), Durham Cathedral (p. 342), and Lindisfarne (p. 365). Canon Carter's preface is somewhat marred by an inaccurate estimate of Dr. Bright's *Chapters of Early English Church*

History. He speaks truly enough of those 'most graphic pictures of the Anglo-Saxon Church,' but when he says that Dr. Bright's 'object did not extend to the details of the lives of the saints of that period, further than in illustrating the main points of the history' (pref. p. iii), he does not allow sufficiently for the notes of Dr. Bright's book, which fill as a rule half of each page, which are crammed with endless details, and are marvellous both for their interest and their accuracy. That it is not correct to hold Mr. Adams up as having the advantage in the matter of detail may be decisively demonstrated by examining his entertaining account of St. Cuthbert with the massive array of facts and references of authoritative historians.¹ We do not know on what principle Mr. Adams has made his list. He includes an account of Rumwald, the child-saint, who only lived three days, and omits such men as Hygbald, who were great administrators of monastic affairs (p. 235). It may be fairly said that a comprehensive and typical selection of names has been made, and that the biographies are written in a popular style which will attract the general reader. It is, we suppose, for his information that stray notes are introduced, without very much uniformity as to their insertion, upon the Anglo-Saxon tribes (p. 3), the monastic hours (p. 96), Penda (p. 233), Monothelism (p. 401), and miscellaneous subjects. Moberley (p. vii) and Lugalbala (p. 331) are misprints. A more serious mistake is that, after all his study, Mr. Adams should feel that 'the miracles with which old writers loved to embellish their pages . . . as a rule, form no part of the lives of the saints ;' and so he regards them as an adventitious growth (p. vi). The truer and deeper view of these miraculous incidents surely is that these holy men were accustomed to trace the providential hand of God in the ordinary affairs of life, shaping their ends by personal intervention. It hardly becomes us, who habitually ignore the personal action of the Almighty, for example in relation to the weather, to cut out from the record of the old saints what was the heart and soul of their lives.

The Spirit on the Waters. The Evolution of the Divine from the Human. By EDWIN A. ABBOTT. (London and New York : Macmillan and Co., 1897.)

MR. ABBOTT accepts what he calls a non-miraculous Christianity. The present volume is the non-critical, general, and constructive part of a work in which Mr. Abbott proposes to set forth the grounds for this paradoxical acceptance. A critical, detailed, and negative part is to appear after a while. It will be sufficient, therefore, at present to confine ourselves chiefly to general remarks on Mr. Abbott's work, and to reserve our detailed criticisms for his second volume. Many of our readers may even think that a non-miraculous Christianity need not detain us at all, especially if they have read the passage of wonderful eloquence in which Mr. Gladstone has

¹ Dr. Bright's *Chapters of Early English Church History*, pp. 176, 214-6, 239-40, 289, 300 ff., 367, 373-4, 380 ff., 384-5, 397-8, 434, 437 ; 2nd edit. 1897. Mr. Plummer's *Bede*, i. 442 ; ii. 444-5.

show
Gosp
hopi
mira
so w
belie
men
We
ortho
in ter
accou
are tr
as the
organ
Mr. A
and t
the In
of Ch
failing
as dif
This
Mr. A
Lord's
259-6
arrivin
reader
worshi
'grave
(p. 46
writers
468-9
Mr.
by 'a
(pref.
sincere
miracu
which
the foo
Christ
sense o
of Hol
solemn
hasty le
the aut
—'may

¹ *The
Robert
1897.*

shown what the attempt to extrude the miraculous element from the Gospels really involves.¹ But there are now many persons who are hoping in a vague way, and from various reasons, that a non-miraculous Christianity is true, and besides our duty towards them, so well discharged by Mr. Gladstone, we cannot be silent when we believe that a phantom is likely to delude many because it is commended in language which has hitherto borne an orthodox meaning. We must go further and express our conviction that when an orthodox preacher nowadays is speaking upon matters of the faith in terms which he believes to be unmistakeable, he has to take into account the fact that there are those among the congregation who are transmuting his language according to their own ideas, using it as the drapery of a skeleton instead of as the clothing of a living organism, preserving the husk while they reject the kernel. When Mr. Abbott talks about 'worshipping God as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,' and 'accepting, in the fullest spiritual sense, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Atonement, and the Divinity of Christ' (pref. p. vii), the unwary reader may well be pardoned for failing to understand at first that these terms are used in new senses, as different from their historical meaning as light is from darkness. This will clearly be demonstrated, however, by the careful perusal of Mr. Abbott's remarks upon the conception of God (pp. 27-40), our Lord's baptism and temptation (pp. 170-1), His personality (pp. 259-65), and His sacrifice (p. 322). For a short and ready mode of arriving at the true value of Mr. Abbott's book, we should advise a reader to glance at the extraordinary suggestions about 'prayer and worship' (pp. 461-5), which are designed to improve upon the 'grave defects and disproportions' of the 'Anglican Prayer Book' (p. 466), and to annex appropriate passages of fine English prose writers to a series of readings from the Bible for family worship (pp. 468-9).

Mr. Abbott is apparently about to revise and correct his results by 'a renewed study of all the Gospels, and especially the fourth' (pref. p. v), before publishing the other part of his work. It is our sincere hope that by so doing he may be led to see that a non-miraculous Christianity is an incredible system of contradiction which is not Christianity at all. On p. 456 a figure is omitted in the footnote. It is quite consistent with Mr. Abbott's inconsistent Christ that 'an early utterance of Jesus' should be 'indicative of a sense of failure' (p. 181); and there is nothing in Mr. Abbott's view of Holy Scripture which prevents him from minimizing the most solemn utterances of St. Paul, who perhaps wrote a multitude of hasty letters 'in the course of his busy life as a missionary—whereas the authors of the Gospels'—a very significant admission, by the way—'may be supposed to have written deliberately' (p. 231).

¹ *The Nineteenth Century* for May 1888. An article on Mrs. Ward's *Robert Elsmere*, reprinted in Mr. Gladstone's *Later Gleanings*, London, 1897.

Eras of the Christian Church. Edited by JOHN FULTON, D.D. LL.D.
'The Age of the Great Western Schism,' by CLINTON LOCKE,
D.D. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.)

ALTHOUGH this handsome book bears the well-known address of Messrs. Clark, it is plainly produced in America; and it is certainly turned out in a fashion of which no publisher anywhere need be ashamed. Paper, print, and binding are alike admirable, the paper perhaps especially so. In the matter of printing we note a curious variation of the art and mystery, as practised in America, from the time-honoured custom of the Caxtons of Europe to place a signature on the front page of every sheet. Here there seem to be no signatures of the sheets, but at the beginning of every chapter the number of the page is placed at the bottom. How that helps the folder we know not. We apologize for mentioning such a detail; but to say truth, the whole book carries us to America almost as vividly as to the Great Schism. It is undeniably a clever book. Though it does not pretend to any extensive use of original authorities, it uses the best secondary, especially Milman and Creighton, and the result is a volume which never allows you time to yawn—we had almost said to breathe—from the beginning to the end. It is indeed a matter of great rejoicing that our busy cousins over the Atlantic should learn the ecclesiastical history of old times. But if this is the way that it is to be done, we fear that we should choose for ourselves to read books of quieter style in some English university or rectory than go to study at Chicago and imbibe the annals of the Church in the form of successive up-to-date newspaper articles. We admire the cleverness of the Western process, and are most willing to give the author that praise which he awards to Pope Martin V. of answering perfectly to the American definition of 'smart.' But, after all, we doubt whether the best method of engaging interest in past history is to tell it in the fashion of the last news of the day.

We grant at once that the men of old time were men like ourselves, and that it is far better to make us realize them as living beside us than to leave them and the scenes they mixed in dead and lifeless in our hands. And if any part of Church history could be selected in which life should be preferred to dignity, it is that which it has fallen to Dr. Locke to treat; for the chief actors in his tale were only too human, and the most unscrupulous filibuster of the West might claim to possess more of the dignity of virtue than Pope John XXIII. Even so, the mere distance of time, the fact that these men, with all their vices and their schemes, are dead and gone, and the vastness of the scale upon which they enacted their wickednesses, might seem to demand more solemnity, so that the reader, besides realizing the facts, might receive some of the awe which they should inspire, and some impression of the spirit of an age which, though men are always men, yet is surely in many ways different from ours. But even such an age as that of the Great Schism contained characters better than those of its popes and kings, and great spiritual questions arose in it. Dr. Locke argues well that the recovery of Christianity from the degradations of such a time furnishes a testimony of its

Divi
stre
and
und
tiani
whic
weig

the
ing
coul
as sh
hope
they
men
for t
that
fashi

myst
level
avera
perfu
God
It wi
whor
Chin
Frati
spirit
all p
terize

T
plent
down
ing v
the l
to A
refor
and
like
that
mate
Fran
stand
Papa
Gree

T
'Wh
very
of wi

Divine truth and power. But the argument would be only strengthened by the recognition of all the goodness, the simplicity, and earnestness, the power of thought and work, which proved an undercurrent in the religion of the time. It was not that Christianity revived after the tyranny was overpast, but that the religion which had been alive all through got rid of the incubus which had weighed it down.

Now, we cannot say that we find Dr. Locke as happy in describing the serious thoughts of that time, or its holy characters, as in depicting its worldly scenes and worldly men. It seems to us as if he could not depend upon his readers for so much attention and interest as should enable them to grasp a very serious subject, and could only hope to give them so much information as might enable them to say they had heard of it. We doubt much the sufficiency of his treatment of the Double Procession of the Holy Ghost (p. 285) to find for that doctrine a place in the reader's intellect. Nor can we think that mysticism would be made clear to the unlearned in the following fashion :

'It may be well to begin by defining what is meant by mystics and mysticism. It refers to a craving to get away from low and unspiritual levels, to break away from the formality and perfunctoriness of the average religious life—and it was perhaps never much lower or more perfunctory than in the fourteenth century—a desire to find a union with God which should be as real as the common relationships of daily life. It will be better understood by mentioning some historical characters to whom the word 'mystic' would apply : Gautama in India, Confucius in China, Fénelon in France, John Bunyan and John Wesley in England, the Fraticelli, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, the many divisions of the spiritual Franciscans. While these differed much in views, their teaching all partook of that quietism, that renunciation of the will, which characterizes mysticism in one or other of its forms' (p. 288).

The determination to be popular or nothing provides us with a plentiful infusion of racy Americanisms. 'The King determined to down this gigantic spectre.' The Pope 'commenced dickering with Ladislas' (the reader who will look up 'dickering' in the New Oxford Dictionary will find that, though it has emigrated to America, it has an old European pedigree). 'The moment any reform questions were brought up the Pope's friends got the floor and talked them to death.' 'The council without Sigismund was like soup without salt.' 'The Pope's partisans would not hear to that.' 'The police were well organized, and before a riot could materialize peace and order were restored ;' 'he argued that until France and England were reconciled, reform in the Church did not stand much of a show.' 'The Pope's chamberlains lifted up the Papal cassock and got the Pope's foot all ready to kiss ; but the Greeks played they did not see it' (pp. 14, 145, 146, 164, 176, 281).

The Preface opens with an ill-omened quotation from Renan : 'When I read over what I have written the matter appears to me very poor, and I perceive that I have put in a multitude of things of which I am not certain.' Our author's experience agrees with

that of the Frenchman, and he admits that the absolute certainty of even the smallest item of the history seems doubtful. We do not wonder that M. Renan, that eminent novelist, should have been visited with a compunctious feeling that he had habitually assumed airs of certainty without reason. This is the nemesis of your graphic historian. He cannot march on without a pause or doubt making everything as real to the eye as if he had witnessed it, and yet have authority with him all the way. Details must be filled in by the imagination. It makes the story very pleasant, but it confounds history with the historical romance. And it is only those historians in whose text everything is vivid and the narrative unbroken by hesitations who need to make such unsparing admissions of uncertainty in their preface. We are bound to say that once Dr. Locke has unburdened himself of this confession of universal doubt in the first paragraph of his book we find nothing but assured confidence in the correctness of his whole story. Nor indeed, considering the public nature of most of the events, can we perceive any great cause for the expression of so great misgivings. It is chiefly when he levels spiritual phenomena to the manners and tone of a very earthly story that we think there would have been room for the expression of doubt and the sense of mystery even within the narrative itself. The sweeping condemnation of the monasticism of the period is not, in our judgment, true to the degree which is so positively claimed for it. And readers of the article upon St. Catherine of Siena which appeared in a recent number of this Review will not think the better of Dr. Locke's judgment for having adopted and even exaggerated the unworthy account which Dean Milman presents of that wonderful life.

'In these days of hypnotic experiences and when so much light has been thrown upon hysteria, much that appeared miraculous to her contemporaries appears very commonplace to us. She was a hysterical cataleptic subject, but by no means a weak-minded one, for her letters which are published show great vigour of intellect and much eloquence and force.'

He thinks that the works about St. Catherine founded on the life by her confessor, Raimondo, 'must be read with many grains of salt. It is a melancholy exhibit of what made a saint in those days, and to us moderns seems like the account of a lunatic rather than of a holy and very distinguished woman' (pp. 75, 76). Alas, if anything about St. Catherine be very commonplace, what term shall we apply to modern Christianity; and if that was what made a saint in those days, what makes a saint in Chicago? It is a pity that upon this subject Dr. Locke did not prefer the more recent authority of Bishop Creighton to that of Dean Milman. In the Bishop he possesses a guide as well versed in the history of a worldly time as if he were a smart American, yet capable of sympathy with spiritual enthusiasm. His epitaph on St. Catherine is more tender than Dr. Locke's. 'Canonized by Pius II, Catharine of Siena has a claim upon our reverence higher than that of a saint of the mediæval Church. A low-born maiden, without education or culture, she gave the

only
tion
purity

T
esting
a very
the r
a hars
rulers
munit

'N
Catho
it that
Protes
which
depend
the po
his bu
to say
repres
favore
and al
must
Martin
be ref
judgm
irrefor
no ora
'M

these
notwit
Popes
ance;
revenu
soon c
indulge
The sa
they ar
and da
submis
the diff

Th
not th
conced
which
every
monar
to tell
secutio
Th
It oper

only possible expression in her age and generation to the aspiration for national unity and for the restoration of ecclesiastical purity.¹ . . .

The attitude of our author towards the Church of Rome is interesting and wholly devoid of bitterness. He seems to regard her as a very important part of the Christian Church in which the spirit of the religion is thoroughly alive, against which no man should speak a harsh word, and which is destined some day, in spite of all that its rulers can do, to fall into line with the mass of Christian communities.

'Now was to commence the "Babylonish captivity" as Roman Catholic historians designate the residence of the popes in Avignon, calling it that because it lasted, like the captivity of the Jews, just seventy years. Protestant historians often apply the word "Babylon" to Papal Rome, which proves it to be a convenient word of cursing, the use of which depends on your point of view' (p. 13). 'Martin V. certainly admitted the power of the Council of Constance to decree matters of faith, for, in his bull against the Hussites, he says, "Every heretic shall be required to say whether he believes that what the holy Council of Constance, representing the universal Church, has sanctioned and sanctions *in favorem fidei et salutis animarum* is binding on all Christian believers, and also that what that synod has condemned as contrary to the faith must be held by all to deserve reprobation." This fact remains clear: Martin V. adopted a decree which declares the judgments of the Pope to be reformatory, and Pius IX. adopted a decree which declares certain judgments of the Pope in matters of faith and morals to be infallible and irreformable. As Gladstone says, "One oracle contradicts another, and no oracle which contradicts itself is infallible"' (p. 233).

'Many of the principles for which the reforming party contended in these three Councils have become, the Vatican Council to the contrary notwithstanding, the working principles of the modern Roman Church. Popes no longer depose princes and absolve subjects from their allegiance; cardinals can no longer hold a dozen sees and pocket their revenues; heretics cannot be burnt or beheaded. The law of libel will soon clap in prison an overzealous bishop who excommunicates and indulgences, while still granted, are not now hawked about the country. The same dogmas may be held by Leo XIII. as by Eugenius IV., but they are often held only as a theory, not as possible to be put in practice; and day by day, in spite of the constant cry of Rome that only by entire submission to her can there be any union of the faithful, facts show that the differences are being softened and the distances lessened' (p. 279).

The author has a good deal to say for this theory, and we doubt not that the concessions of the Church which professes never to concede anything are more observable in the new society of America which is separated by the Atlantic from the scenes where almost every relic of ancient times bears record that there the Papal monarchy once ruled. In America there is not a crumbling building to tell of mediæval times, and even the very memory of ancient persecutions belongs to the Anglican not the Roman Church.

The 'era,' which is here treated has a veritable unity of its own. It opens with the last glimpse of the Papacy in its pride when Boni-

¹ *History of the Papacy*, pp. 1-71.

face VIII. issued his insane claims. His audacity never was exceeded by emperor or high priest; but the time was too late for them. The papacy had pushed its dominion so far into the secular world that it had lost connexion with its religious base and become itself secular. And the earthly powers learnt to regard it as one of themselves; they doubted and then disbelieved its Divine sanction, and they inflicted on it the insults of coercion and war, and the still worse insult of using it as their tool. The migration to Avignon followed upon the defeat of the Papacy by Philip of France. And the long separation of the Popes from their proper seat led to the election of one Pope for the Italian seat and another for the French. The schism was a kind of testimony to a strength in the Papal idea, and a desire of man to be ruled, so great that it would even bear dividing, and that there was infallibility enough for two. But at the same time it was a testimony to the loss of faith in the sacredness of the office on the part of its own representatives. Popes and cardinals showed no fear of committing again and again the crime of high treason against that Divine monarchy the supreme sacredness of which among all earthly institutions they maintained at any cost of bloodshed. The cardinals who elected Urban VI. were either guilty of a sacrilegious farce in pretending to choose him only to save their own lives, or else they were guilty of the no less heinous crime of condemning an election which they knew to be perfectly valid, just because the object of their choice had disappointed them. This was the origin of the schism—like the wrath of Achilles which produced the woes of Troy. The great Councils which restored the Papal monarchy, under conditions which proved to be futile, wind up the era. And we think Dr. Locke might well have omitted the brief chapters which conclude his volume and take much from the symmetry of the design. They do not, as we have before hinted, furnish us with information of any depth or sufficiency upon the important subjects of which they treat. It is the conclusion of the great councils which 'closes the incident' to which his volume relates.

The Land of the Monuments: Notes of Egyptian Travel. By JOSEPH POLLARD. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

To criticize Mr. Pollard's book as a contribution to Egyptology would be as absurd as to review it as a literary work, for it is neither the one nor the other, though doubtless the author wished this offspring of his pen to serve the double purpose.

The Land of the Monuments is a curious and unhappy mixture of Murray and water, religious sentimentality, texts of Scripture, behindhand Egyptology, many blunders, and much bad English.

The book was published in the autumn of 1896, but from internal evidence the facts narrated bear the date 1892, as on p. 52 we read that Mr. Pollard's party witnessed the distribution of food by the grave of the late Khedive of Egypt, Thewfik Pasha, who died on January 7 of that year. It is most unfortunate that the author has not brought his book up to date, as much of the information is now actually inaccurate and therefore misleading. At p. 169 we

are told that 'Pyramid-building appears to have ceased with the Sixth Dynasty;' the discoveries of M. de Morgan made at Dahshûr during the last four years have proved incontrovertibly that Pyramid-building continued until the Twelfth Dynasty. Asyût, we are told, 'is the present terminus of the Cairo railway' (p. 188), a false and most misleading statement, as for some few years the railway has been gradually extending southwards from Asyût. When *The Land of the Monuments* was first published Abû Negga Hamâdi, 380 miles south of Cairo, was the terminus; and the line as far as Kench, possibly as far as Luxor, will be open shortly. These are but two specimens of inaccuracy out of many others which may be easily found.

Mr. Pollard commits himself cheerfully to some marvellous blunders. That august body the Senate of London University would be somewhat amazed to hear that an exhibition of Dr. Petrie's 'finds' from Koptos had been held within their sacred precincts at Burlington House in August 1894. Yet such is practically what he tells us at p. 262. The exhibition was really held in University College, Gower Street, where Dr. Petrie, the 'finder,' holds the Edwards Chair of Egyptology. On p. 152 we read that 'the Serapeum is near to Mariette's house,' and that 'Serapeum was therefore the appellation of the tombs of the Apis bulls.' Now, the Serapeum was the exterior temple which surmounted the tombs of the Apis bulls; this temple has long since been destroyed, and at the present day very few remains of it can be seen. An avenue of sphinxes led up to it and two pylons stood before it; round it was the usual enclosure. It was distinguished from other Egyptian temples by having in one of its chambers an opening which led by an inclined passage to the rock below the desert; this gave access to the great sepulchral chambers wherein reposed the embalmed remains of the Apis bulls. Living, the Apis was worshipped in a magnificent temple at Memphis and lodged in an adjoining palace—the Apieum; dead, he was buried in excavated vaults at Saqqâra, called the Apis Mausoleum, and worshipped in a temple built over them, called the Serapeum. Like many another traveller in Egypt, Mr. Pollard has fallen into the trap of the 'sycamore fig' (p. 75, &c.) The tree is truly a fig, but it is a sycamore, or sycamine—not a sycamore, a tree which belongs to another family and does not bear figs. As a member of the Council of Biblical Archæology it might be supposed that Mr. Pollard would have had some knowledge of Greek, which would have saved him from this mistake, but perhaps spelling is not his *forte*, as we notice that he writes of a 'censor (*sic*) of burning incense' represented in the temple of Chousu (*sic*) (p. 324), a god of whom we have never heard. Perhaps the printers are responsible for these two errors of spelling, as well as for writing Dr. Petrie as 'Petri,' and Dr. Brugsch as 'Brusseli,' and 'nefern' for 'neferu.' Surely the publishers also have shown carelessness in sending out a book with a double number of pp. 129–144.

The author was indeed extremely fortunate if during his one visit to Egypt he saw 'burly lads' (p. 167) and a scarab rolling a ball of earth 'about the size of an ordinary billiard ball' (p. 342); the

reviewer, after a long residence in Egypt, has never seen a beetle's ball that approaches in the least such dimensions, and the only burly lads are not country children, but occasional horribly fat Jew boys in Cairo and Alexandria. Does Mr. Pollard really mean that in default of a *north* wind the dahabiyehs on the Nile are rowed? Surely he must know that rowing is only resorted to on the downward voyage. If the wind is contrary in going up stream the dahabiyehs are tracked or poled, or else tied up against the river bank. He is also charmingly unsophisticated when he writes rapturously of the natives, and particularly of the Bedâwin Arabs at the Pyramids. At the best of times their one and only idea is how much bakshish they can squeeze out of their visitors, and the Pyramid Arabs have for long obtained an unenviable notoriety for their rapacity and their annoyance of tourists.

We learn (p. 79) that 'the ancient Egyptians worshipped one God, an Omnipotent Spirit'; this is a very wide statement, and one liable to mislead the class of readers who we imagine will use this book; but, unfortunately, the author, after stating this as a fact, proceeds to inform us that 'many other gods were recognized in later times' (p. 83); that 'the adoration of sacred animals was a peculiar feature of the Egyptian religion' (p. 86); and on p. 323, in direct contradiction of the first statement, we read that 'the Egyptians were worshippers of the host of heaven.' Which of these statements are we to regard as the true one? Moreover we did not know that devil-worship ever obtained in Egypt (p. 249).

It is a great pity that Mr. Pollard finds it necessary on all and every occasion to bring in texts of Scripture, some of them not always appropriate. Sentiment we approve of, but the nineteenth century is too old to put up with sentimentality, especially sentimentality of a religious sort. Words fail the author to describe a sunset, which apparently affected them all to tears; only one young lady managed 'very appropriately to express her feelings on the occasion in the words of the hymn, 'Thou who,' &c. (p. 197). The sight of the *Lotus corniculatus* growing by the desert track between Aswân and Shellal—a not very rare sight—causes our author to burst forth in the hackneyed lines, 'Full many a flower,' &c., and examples of this kind might easily be multiplied.

As a contribution to Egyptology we regret to say that Mr. Pollard's book is not only useless but misleading. Each year that passes sees some new discovery made, which is duly published, so that everyone can be now thoroughly *au courant* with the last 'finds' and the latest theories. To them, therefore, the *Land of the Monuments* is useless, but to those who are unable to keep themselves quite up to date it would be in many places, as we have already shown, misleading. For some time past a year has never closed without the publication of some useful and thoroughly up-to-date work, more or less popular, upon Egyptology, thus leaving no room for antiquated, and therefore erroneous, information. The diary in Egypt of a garrulous traveller can at best be but a copy of his guide book, watered down with his own reflections and minor observations, and padded out with snips

of hist
to our
one o
Pollar
it is a
instea

Readi

o
N
d
th
E
N

In ou
first c
Vern
work,
which
the fir
runnin
notice
the ru
transl
portion
tion, a
again.
menta
the re
of 400
inasm
that t
avoid
subject
which
has be
also g
were l
in full
moreo
of val
now g
Fran
fully
De Co

1 A
our re
before.
2 A
by Mr

of history more or less accurate. This traveller's diary does not add to our knowledge of Egypt by one new fact, nor does it contain one original observation. From the Preface we understand that Mr. Pollard was requested to publish this volume; he has done so, but it is a pity that it was not given to the public in the spring of 1892 instead of the autumn of 1896.

Readings on the Purgatorio of Dante, chiefly based on the Commentary of Benvenuto da Imola. By the Hon. WILLIAM WARREN VERNON, M.A. (Accademico Corrispondente della Crusca and Cavaliere di S. Maurizio e Lazzaro in Italy). With an Introduction by the late Very Rev. Dean of St. Paul's. Two vols. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. (London: Macmillan and Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897.)

IN our Number for July 1890 will be found a Short Notice of the first edition of this work, published in 1889. And although Mr. Vernon now tells us that this second edition is practically a new work, we do not find in it anything to alter the general opinion which we then formed.¹ For he also states that the general plan of the first edition has not been altered, although the translation and running commentary have been entirely rewritten. In our former notice we pointed out our objections to the extreme diffuseness of the running commentary and its necessary repetition, in effect, in the translation. We said: 'Very frequently an equivalent of the sense of the portion of text about to be quoted and translated precedes the translation, and the translation which follows is practically the same thing over again.' This remark still holds good; and when to this system of commentary a large increase in the number of notes is added, we have the result in the amplification of the two original volumes, of upwards of 400 pages each, into two of 579 and 654 pages respectively. Now, inasmuch as the *Purgatorio* contains but 4,755 verses, we still think that these 'Readings' run to an inordinate length. Nor can we avoid a feeling of relief when we reflect that we ourselves were not subjected to the system of studying each canto in fractional parts; which, initiated by Benvenuto and the other early commentators, has been adopted throughout by Mr. Vernon. Once more, we are also glad that in our own early studies of the *Divina Commedia* we were left to discover much for ourselves which we find here explained in full and frequently unnecessary detail. Benvenuto's own reflections, moreover, which are frequently recorded, are very often the reverse of valuable or recondite. We are glad, therefore, that Mr. Vernon now gives greater prominence than before to the annotations of Francesco da Buti and Jacopo della Lana; also that he draws more fully upon that saddest but ablest of all ethical disquisitions, the *De Consolatione Philosophie* of Boethius.² We could wish, however,

¹ As the present Notice proceeds upon different lines, we may refer our readers to this former one, to avoid repeating what we have said before.

² An excellent translation of this work into English prose and verse, by Mr. H. R. James, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford, has recently been

that he had made more liberal use of the labours of the Platonist commentator Landino, full as they are of 'pensier contemplativi.' Mr. Vernon, however, earns our thanks for having brought into deserved prominence the *Bellezze della Divina Commedia* of Cesari and the *I sette Cerchi del Purgatorio di Dante* of Paolo Perez. The latter, in particular, is full of beautiful and appropriate reflections.

We feel that we can almost forgive everything in other respects which oppresses us as redundant in these volumes, when we study such of Mr. Vernon's notes as are philological. Here he has made the ground substantially his own. In researches into Dante's meaning, he is under enormous obligations to Scartazzini, and many readers will agree with us that he has been almost too lavish in his use of the excellent Concordance of Mr. Fay; but as an accomplished scholar not merely of the Italian language but of the Tuscan idiom and dialect, he has no need of indebtedness to anyone. With judicious recourse to the valuable *Gran Dizionario* of Signori Tommaseo and Bellini, and the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, and his own intimate knowledge of Nannucci, he sets before us most admirable expositions of innumerable words and phrases, some archaic or obsolete, but many still in common use in Tuscany, and from his long residence in Florence as familiar to him as household words. Considerations of space prevent us from any detailed reference to these notes, but we may refer our readers to Mr. Vernon's spirited defence of himself against a critic who had censured him for translating 'Che si stavano all' ombra' by 'who were lying in the shade' (*Purg.* iv. 104). See his note *ad loc.* (i. 149). We must quote a characteristic passage from it. 'No Italian would ever use *stare* (by itself) for "to stand." He would say "star in piedi" or "star ritto." If one wanted to render "the woman was sitting, the man was standing," one could not say "La donna era seduta, l' uomo stava." It would only mean "was abiding." Suppose the case of a patient lying on a sofa, who on his doctor entering the room is about to stand up; the doctor would exclaim "Stia! stia!" i.e. "Remain lying down," or "remain as you were." Mr. Vernon is equally emphatic in his objection to the rendering of 'dolce,' when applied by one man to another, by 'sweet.' Commenting on *Purg.* viii. 3, 'Lo di ch' han detto ai dolci amici addio,' he protests (i. 275) that the word 'sweet' is wholly inadmissible between two men. 'One can say "Such a man has a very sweet disposition," but not "My sweet friend," from one man to another.' Longfellow must, therefore, be in sad disgrace with him, as he renders 'Virgilio dolcissimo padre' in *Purg.* xxx. 50, by 'Virgilius, sweetest of all fathers.'

We pass on to notice a few passages in which we must differ from Mr. Vernon either in an adopted reading or in a translation. Since the publication of his first edition the Oxford *Dante* has appeared, and we think that in several instances he has been injudicious in following its text. Take, as the earliest of these, the reading 'ôra' for

published (Elliot Stock, 1897). We can strongly recommend it to English readers not familiar with crabbed Latin.

Mr. V.
Italia
word
comin
that (
admi
under
rema
overc
upon
befor
of the
line.'
'ôra'
Comm
as ov
appro
dawn
in wh
nest t
time a
may b
them
shimm

1 s
says th

and M
Petrar

But co
Fur. C

Be it a
culariz

Will M
line 16
and (2
'aura'
be his

'ora'—'breeze' for 'hour'—in the first line of the passage *Purg.* i. 115-7:

'L' alba vinceva l' ora mattutina
Che fuggia innanzi, sì che di lontano
Conobbi il tremolar della marina.'

Mr. Vernon, reading 'ôra' in line 115, with Scartazzini and other Italian commentators followed by the Oxford *Dante*, and taking the word as equivalent to 'aura,' translates thus:—'The dawn was overcoming the breeze of early morning, which was retreating before it, so that (even) from afar I distinguished the shimmering of the sea.' He admits, however (i. 35), that an overwhelming majority of commentators understand 'ora' to be 'the matin hour.' But he relies upon Cesari's remark that it is not easy to picture to oneself how the dawn can overcome the hour, nor how the hour can fly before the dawn; and upon the same commentator's conclusion that 'the dawn was driving before it that light breeze which is wont to spring up at the approach of the sun, and which imparts a tremor to the sea upon the coast line.' But to this we reply, in the first place, that the contraction 'ôra' = 'aura' does not occur in any other passage of the *Divina Commedia*.¹ And as to the supposed difficulty in regarding the dawn as overcoming the hour which flies before it, surely this is a most appropriate description of the gradual increase of light as the time of dawn advances. Compare the beautiful opening lines of *Par.* xxiii. in which Dante speaks of a bird which, sitting upon her younglings' nest through the night which hides all things from us, anticipates the time and yearns for the sun and the breaking of the dawn, that she may behold them again and set about the pleasing labour of finding them food. Moreover, Dante is not telling us the *cause* of the shimmering of the sea, but explaining how it came to pass that he

¹ Scartazzini, no doubt, reads 'ôre' in *Purg.* xxviii. 16, where Dante says that the birds in the Terrestrial Paradise

'con piena letizia l' ore prime
Cantando ricevièno intra le foglie,'

and Mr. Vernon here also follows him. Scartazzini cites, in support, from Petrarch, Sonnet 143:

'Parmi d' udirli, udendo i rami, e l' ôre,
E le frondi, e gli augelli lagnarsi.'

But contrast with this a much more apposite passage in Ariosto (*Orl. Fur.* Canto xxv. st. 94):

'A salutar la nova luce
Pei verdi rami incominciar gli augelli.'

Be it also remembered that Dante in line 7 of *Purg.* xxviii. had particularized

'Un' aura dolce, senza mutamento
Avere in se.'

Will Mr. Vernon, and those who agree with him in reading 'l' ôre' in line 16, explain (1) the sudden change in spelling from 'aura' to 'ôre,' and (2) the mention of further 'breezes' immediately after that of the 'aura dolce,' which, we will concede to Mr. Vernon, may be supposed to be his favourite 'light breeze of early morning, blowing from the east'?

could distinguish it, viz., by reason of the brightening light. Mr. Vernon's quotation of *En. vii. 9*, 'splendet tremulo sub lumine [not 'tremulâ sub aurâ'] pontus,' supports our view rather than his. We are glad to see that Mr. Fay does not admit 'ôra' or 'ôre' into his excellent Concordance. We will give one more instance only of a reading adopted by Mr. Vernon, against which we must protest, as we have done already in a Short Notice of the Oxford *Dante*. We allude to the atrocious

'Guardaci ben ; ben sem, ben sem Beatrice' (*Purg. xxx. 73*),

where 'Guardaci' and each 'sem' are substituted for the almost universally adopted reading 'Guardami' and 'son.' Our apology for recurring to this subject is that since dealing with it on the occasion referred to, we have come across a passage in Ariosto's *Altre Stanze*, stanza ii. lines 2 to 4, where, addressing his lady, he says

'ho di voi' 'nel cuore
Real costumi, angelica favella,
Andar celeste, e star degno d' onore.'

It must strike everyone that, in this portrayal of her excellences, the poet had in his mind Dante's description of his Beatrice. The 'real costumi'—'queenly manners'—recall Dante's 'regalmentè,' which, in *Purg. xxx. 70*, he applies to Beatrice's attitude, and which, *pace* Scartazzini, has nothing to do with the use of the plural number by a queen in speaking of herself. Beatrice, queenly in dignity, *speaks* 'con angelica voce in sua favella' (*Inf. ii. 57*). Ariosto's 'andar celeste' recalls Dante's 'mia celeste scorta' (*Par. xxi. 23*), and 'star degno d' onore' his comparison of Beatrice to a 'donna onesta che permane Di sè sicura' (*Par. xxvii. 31, 32*). We are persuaded that neither poet regarded his lady as aping a sovereign's diction.

On the other hand, we must congratulate Mr. Vernon on refusing to be led away by Scartazzini and Dr. Moore in reading 'i Melanesi' for 'il Melanese' in *Purg. viii. 80*. The speaker there, the Shade of Judge Nino Visconti of Gallura, is contrasting himself with his widow's second husband, the Milanese Visconti, not with the Milanese army.

We pass on to consider line 44 in *Purg. xxi.*, 'quel che il ciel da sè in sè riceve,' which Mr. Vernon renders 'what from itself Heaven receives into itself,' i.e. what, having its origin in Heaven, is received back by heaven. By this, he says, is to be understood the soul, which came from God and goes back to Him when purified. No doubt, if this interpretation is correct, it makes excellent sense with what follows. But can 'quel che il ciel da sè in sè riceve' be construed as though the words ran thus: 'quel da sè che il ciel in sè riceve'? Is not the natural construction that which takes 'da sè in sè' with 'riceve'? and the meaning 'that which heaven by itself receives into itself'? Do we not unduly wrench the grammar in referring 'da sè' back to 'quel'? and, if not, does 'quel da sè' mean 'that which is from

¹ Cf. *Purg. xxvii. 135*: 'Che qui la terra sol da sè produce.'

itself
'E qu
Scarta
the su
that m
'quel
it imp
A
note a
that '
the wo
Inf. x
lena 'P
Ou
says of

We sub
'Ne
was ma
itself.
In ren
literate
primary
rated '
alluded
is the s
And So
and Ar
again b
Will
remind

Compar

Both of
fonte,' v
Vernon

We
the val

VOL.

itself'? One would expect 'quel di sè,' as in *Purg.* xxxii. 51, 'E quel di lei a lei lasciò legato.' Mr. Vernon has here followed Scartazzini and Dr. Moore; but the rendering which we suggest has the support of Benassuti and Fraticelli. It must not be forgotten that many commentators, Fraticelli among them, read the line thus: 'quel che il ciel in sè da sè riceve;' and if that be correct we think it impossible that 'da sè' can be taken apart from the verb.

A few more remarks and we will conclude. Mr. Vernon, in a note at vol. ii. p. 224 on the words 'ciò fornirò,' in *Purg.* xxii. 6, says that 'only in *Par.* xi. 132¹ do we find our English signification of the word [fornire], to furnish, to provide.' But has he not forgotten *Inf.* xxiv. 58, 59, 'Leva' mi allor, mostrandomi fornito Meglio di lena'?

Our last reference shall be to *Purg.* xxxiii. 43-5, where Dante says of the emaciated Shade of Forese:

'Mai non l'avrei riconosciuto al viso;
Ma nella voce sua mi fu palese
Ciò che l'aspetto in sè avea conquiso.'

We subjoin Mr. Vernon's translation:

'Never should I have recognized him by his face; but in his voice was made manifest to me that which his aspect had obliterated within itself.'

In rendering 'conquiso' (participle of 'conquidere') by 'obliterated' he follows Blanc, as did Scartazzini before him. The primary meaning of the word is 'conquered,' but we think 'obliterated' is fully warranted in this context. And we should not have alluded to the passage but that Blanc lays stress on the fact that this is the sole place in the *Divina Commedia* where 'conquiso' occurs. And Scartazzini, though he quotes instances of its use from Petrarch and Ariosto, fails to notice, as does Mr. Vernon, that it is used again by Dante himself in the *Canzoniere*.

Will Mr. Vernon, well read in Petrarch as he is, let us also remind him of that poet's imitation of Dante, *Purg.* xxxiii. 112-14?—

'Eufates e Tigri
Veder mi parve uscir d'una fontana,
E quasi amici dipartirsi pigri.'

Compare Petrarch, sonnet 44, lines 7 and 8:

'E cercherassi 'l Sol là oltre ond' esce
D' un medesimo fonte Eufate e Tigre.'

Both of them, of course, borrowed the allusion from 'un medesimo fonte,' viz. Boethius, *Philos. Consol.* lib. v. metr. 1, quoted by Mr. Vernon:

'Tigris et Euphrates uno se fonte resolvunt,
Et mox adjunctis dissociantur aquis.'

We now take leave of these volumes, with a full appreciation of the valuable matter which they contain, and in the hope, at no

¹ 'Le cappe fornisce poco panno.'

distant date, of welcoming the appearance of Mr. Vernon's promised 'Readings' on the *Paradiso*.

Documents illustrative of English Church History, compiled from Original Sources. By HENRY GEE, B.D., F.S.A., and WILLIAM JOHN HARDY, F.S.A. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.)

THIS book will meet with a ready welcome from every student of English Church History, because there is no other volume which contains so much of this kind in so compendious a form or at so reasonable a price. Theological students have long been looking for such a book. Moreover, a book which has the express commendation, in regard to plan and editing, of the present Bishop of Oxford, and which has passed under the eyes of Professor W. Bright and the late Archdeacon Perry, is bound to find acceptance with Churchmen. We learn from the Preface that it was not intended at first to include any documents belonging to the period before 1066, but that the editors gave way on this point, and have allowed the first fifty pages to be filled with a selection of such documents as seemed to be most important. We have, accordingly, among others, the proceedings of the Councils of Hertford, Hatfield, and Cloveshoo, and the Tithe Ordinance of Athelstan. Between the Norman Conquest and the Reformation (pp. 52-144) the chief documents included in the volume are the Constitutions of Clarendon, Magna Carta, and the Statutes of Mortmain, Provisors, and Præmunire. But the longest portion of the book, as was to be expected, has been given to documents belonging to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (pp. 145-670). Canons and Articles have been excluded, for the most part, as being easily accessible in other modern works. The source of each document is carefully given, the date is recorded on every page, there is a summary of each paragraph in the margin, and occasional notes are added at the foot of the page. There is no index, but the table of contents is very full. The only criticisms that we would offer upon this most helpful volume are: (1) Was it wise to give translations only, especially where the Latin or Norman-French is difficult to procure? (2) Was it advisable to give only the titles of the Canons of 1640 (as on p. 535), when even Cardwell has not given the full text of them?

A Forgotten Gospel: Lectures on Doctrine delivered in St. George's Parish Church, Belfast. By HUGH DAVIS MURPHY, D.D., Rector. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1896.)

THESE lectures upon Church doctrine were probably most useful in Belfast, but they have not the same value in England, because High Church principles are now so generally accepted among us, that English Churchmen would feel that Dr. Murphy's teaching, although generally sound and good, left much to be desired both in depth and thoroughness. In a word, the standard of doctrine is not advanced enough for English Churchmen. For example, no Churchman could be satisfied with the lecture on Confirmation (First Series,

Lecture
ture V
benefi
very f
Murph
(except
and h
does
like t
Matri
nition
has n
'orda
part v
among
Sacram
charac
ackno
Ordin
'outw
Holy
grace
is co
Disse
Series
(First
Series
Churc
though
in ma
Episc
to the
his le
the C
his re
with
that t
lawful
is app
of Ire
is wel
has so
to con
most,
things
views
has so
Series
partec
say th

Lecture V.), and very few with that upon Holy Communion (Lecture VI.); for in neither case are we instructed as to the effects and benefits of these ordinances, and in the latter case the doctrine falls very far short of what may be called 'a Catholic standard.' Dr. Murphy is terribly afraid of calling any ordinance 'a sacrament' (except the two 'sacraments of the Gospel') even in a lesser sense, and his zeal upon this point leads him into saying, 'Confirmation does not fulfil the first condition, it has no outward and visible sign, like the water in Baptism and the bread and wine in the Eucharist. Matrimony does not fulfil a single condition of our Church's definition' (p. 125). He says the same thing of Ordination, viz. that it has no 'outward and visible sign,' but in neither case does he add 'ordained of God,' or we could understand him better. For our own part we dislike, as much as Dr. Murphy does, this continual talk among English Churchmen of a certain type about 'the Seven Sacraments' (p. 126); but we should not like to deny a sacramental character to Confirmation, Matrimony, and Holy Orders, and we acknowledge that the laying on of hands in the first and third Ordinance, as well as the joining of hands in the second, are truly 'outward and visible signs,' and in the case of Confirmation and Holy Orders these 'signs' are instruments 'of an inward and spiritual grace given unto' the recipients. Dr. Murphy does best when he is combating the ultra-protestantism of Presbyterians and other Dissenters upon subjects like Conversion and Assurance (Second Series, Lectures III. and IV.). When he treats of Extempore Prayer (First Series, Lecture III.), or of Fasting and Almsgiving (Second Series, Lectures I. and II.), he is able to put the teaching of the Church, or the duty to be enforced, in plain and practical terms, though at times he is apt to become too familiar and conversational in manner for the dignity of the pulpit. He is a strong advocate of Episcopacy upon its historical side, but whether he holds it to belong to the *esse* or only the *bene esse* of the Church we cannot tell from his lecture (First Series, Lecture II.). So, again, his conception of the Church as a visible society is admirable, but there is a defect in his representation of it as a supernatural organization; and in dealing with the Sin of Schism (Second Series, Lecture VI.), while he insists that the Church of Ireland, not the Roman Catholic body, has the lawful Irish succession (p. 304, comp. pp. 15-17), his whole attitude is applicable rather to the condition of religious bodies in the north of Ireland than to the position of the English Church. Dr. Murphy is well acquainted with Protestant and Evangelical literature, and has some knowledge of the Early Christian Fathers, and is often able to convict his hearers out of the mouth of those whom they admire most, while he appeals to history and the Scriptures. He says smart things now and again, and makes some clever home thrusts, but his views upon the Eucharistic sacrifice (p. 131) are weak, and, while he has some beautiful thoughts about the Communion of Saints (Second Series, Lecture V.), he hardly brings out the full relation of the departed to the living in the body of Christ. On the whole, we should say that these lectures would not be largely read by English Church-

men, unless they were put in a position of antagonism to those who hold extreme Protestant views, in which case they might find in them some useful answers to their objections to the teaching of the Church.

The Sanctuary of Suffering. By ELEANOR TEE. With a Preface by the Rev. J. P. F. DAVIDSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias', Earl's Court; President of the Guild of All Souls'. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

In spite of Mr. Davidson's sympathetic and appreciative preface we cannot but pronounce this book—reverent, thoughtful, and earnest though it be, both in purpose and character—to be very disappointing. Its title led us to suppose that it was a volume written for chronic invalids by one of themselves; but when we came to examine it carefully we felt that it would most probably prove to be tedious, if not tiresome, to those who were laid by with long sickness. Here and there we found chapters which would be really helpful—e.g. 'Sickness' (p. 219) and 'Poverty' (p. 236)—and, indeed, the latter part of the book is much to be preferred to the earlier portions, because it is more natural and practical, whereas the earlier chapters are devoted to the expansion of a doubtful theory about pain, suffering, and sacrifice, which is founded upon the Scotist view of the Incarnation, and we are not prepared to endorse this view. Mr. Davidson has dealt tenderly with the author's strong conviction that the Incarnation is independent of the Fall, and that Sacrifice has no necessary connexion with Sin, when he says—

'Such subjects as Pain, in its connection with the Fall, and in its aspects as independent of the Fall, and the Incarnation, viewed as a part of God's original Purpose, modified indeed in its character, but not necessitated by human Sin,—and other kindred points are touched with a sympathetic hand, so as to open up sources of spiritual consolation and devout thought, rather than to limit, by mere definition, what lies beyond our spiritual vision' (pp. ix, x).

We cannot take Evolution for granted, as the writer does, nor can we regard pain, before the Fall, as a beneficent power from God to enable man to work out his ideal, and, since the Fall, as punitive and remedial only, nor can we wholly separate suffering from sin. It is useless to speculate upon what might have been if there had been no Fall; and, in our judgment, to say, as our author does, 'that the foreknowledge of man's Fall involved a fore-provision of the remedy of that Fall' (p. 99) is practically to unsay all that has been said before respecting the Incarnation and the Sacrifice as independent of the Fall.

The following passage will show the general position of the writer upon this point of theology, viz. :—

'The Incarnation of God would, we cannot but feel, have been of the ordinance of God even if man had not 'fallen,' for by that means alone could man secure his perfect end—union with God. It must have been of the Divine Will, for without that God would not truly have given Himself to and for man; and, as "union (by sacrifice) is the term of

love,
Incarn
this pe
Creati
ones
for lov
be exc
fore w
been in

TH
in the
Baptis
'were
'newn
do we
rection
fice' i
partak
surely
Christ
'the e
yet it
find it
158-7
selves
power

As
with
becau
tion c
what
Throu
religio
Litera
has re
tion c
of log
tunate
theolo
that t
faith.'
use of
always

On th

SOME
Cailla
a littl
which

love," God and man would not have been in perfect affinity and kinship. Incarnation meant to God the Immolation of Himself for the sake of this perfect affinity and kinship, whereby alone the chief object of His Creative Scheme of Love could realize complete bliss. There was to be oneness of life and being between Himself and the man created by Him for love, in which man should experience true bliss; and this could not be except by Self-Sacrifice and the acceptance of the Sacrifice. Therefore we feel that, irrespective of the Fall, suffering must always have been in the world' (pp. 48, 49).

The writer gives due recognition to the place of the Sacraments in the Christian life, but it is regrettable that in regard to Holy Baptism no power or effect is attributed to the Resurrection; we 'were baptized *into* His death' (p. 138), but nothing is said about 'newness of life,' or new birth, through Christ's Resurrection, nor do we remember to have read anything in this book about the Resurrection; and in regard to Holy Communion 'the Altar of Sacrifice' is dwelt upon to the exclusion of any idea of our being made partakers thereby of the risen and glorified life of Jesus. This is surely a great loss; for a theology in which the Resurrection of Christ is not a prominent feature, since it is the very foundation of 'the endless life' (pp. 147-57), is wholly inadequate for Christians; yet it is absent from Part v. of this book, where we should expect to find it. It is of no use to exalt the Sacrament of the Altar (pp. 158-78), as the connecting power between the Incarnation and ourselves, and overlook that which makes the blessed Sacrament a living power in us.

As we have said, the practical part of the book, which begins with 'Things New and Old' (p. 209), is much the most helpful, because the most natural; and it is a relief to get rid of the reiteration of the Scotist theory, which leads to mere speculation about what might have been, and finds but little support in Holy Scripture. Throughout the book one finds passages of great beauty and intense religious feeling, together with illustrations from Art and Science and Literature which delight the reader, and show how widely our author has read and studied; but one experiences also a sense of exaggeration continually, and regrets the superabundance of words, the lack of logical order, and the enormous length of the sentences. Unfortunately the writer has taken certain parts of *Lux Mundi* for her theological standpoint, and has not perceived the whole tendency of that teaching, because she has not grasped 'the proportion of the faith.' The text, too, is marred by an absurd error in the frequent use of the '*via dolorosa*' (pp. 175, 176, 190, 218, &c.) as if it were always an ablative case.

On the Use of Science to Christians. By EMMA MARIE CAILLARD. (London: Nisbet and Co., 1897.)

SOME months ago the attention of our readers was called to Miss Caillard's remarkable book *Progressive Revelation*. We now welcome a little book of ninety-five pages, by the same writer, on the benefit which Christians may gain from Science—this last word being used

to mean physical science. It is not an attempt to reconcile Faith and Science. It is still more emphatically not an attempt at the impossible task of constructing the Christian religion out of scientific data. Such an attempt would disparage revelation, which would be superfluous if science could discover all that is revealed in Christ. The Creed is not a short cut to the goal which science would reach with arduous endeavour. But Miss Caillard (herself an ardent believer in the Christian Revelation and in Him who is revealed) addresses her fellow-Christians in the hope of showing them what new and invigorating light is thrown on the old Faith by modern scientific thought.

It is, no doubt, most dangerous to identify Christianity with this or that form of science or philosophy, just as it is most dangerous to identify it with this or that form of polity. The polity, the theory may pass away, but 'the word of the Lord endureth for ever.' But it is one thing to say, for instance, that the Gospel is an antedated Hegelianism, and quite another to say that Hegel throws new light on the Gospel. Each age, as it comes to contemplate the Gospel, brings with it certain political, scientific, metaphysical prepossessions, which cause it to regard the one Gospel from a point of view which is not precisely that of other ages. It is not to be expected, then, or desired, that minds influenced by modern views of physics, biology, geology should regard the Christian revelation precisely in the same way in which the same revelation was regarded before the birth of these sciences.

It is possible to think that these sciences contradict the Faith; it is possible to think that they are identical with the Faith; it is possible to establish faith and science in air-tight compartments of the mind, so that neither should touch or influence the other. Miss Caillard attempts a nobler work—to show in what way scientific progress can be borrowed as Egyptian spoil to decorate the faith of God's Israel.

She works out, then, with much skill and much reverence, such theses as these: that the modern conception of the Unity of Nature corroborates the revealed truth of the Unity of God; that the consistency of natural laws argues a methodical steadfastness in the Creator, which harmonizes with the Christian doctrine of submissive yet co-operative prayer; that the 'close connexion between mind and body,' which are yet not identical, finds a guarantee in the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the flesh; that the conception of the world as not merely made, but 'made to make itself,' brings into clear light the constant presence of God with His creation. We appreciate very highly a chapter in which she employs the abundant pain in the world to show that 'happiness *per se* is not the end of creation,' but that perfection is (p. 35). Nature tells us that sacrifice is the principle of progress; Revelation tells us that this is the case because God is love, and is manifested in the sacrifice of His Son. And we cordially agree with her that the Apostle's words, 'We walk by faith, not by sight,' do not mean 'We walk by faith, not by reason.'

should
this li
they
the su
into
neith

Philo

A H
fulfil
Lectu
secon
cumb
a na
wher
hard
beyo
the f
the l
phil
neces
tied
omn

of T
exce
But
be a
an e
lectu
cons
stan
his
ther
migh
man
say
mor
conv
elen
If it
it is
frau
Pow
mar

There are, of course, passages on which, if we had space, we should wish to offer some criticism ; but on the whole we commend this little book, which is written in a very lucid style, to those (and they are many) who hold the Faith, yet fear it can be held only on the sufferance of science. Such timid faith is apt to break down into a chaotic agnosticism. Miss Caillard proves that science is neither the rival nor the enemy of faith, but its valuable servant.

Philosophy of Theism. By ALEXANDER CAMPBELL FRASER, LL.D., &c. Second Series. (Edinburgh and London : William Blackwood and Sons, 1896.)

A HOPE which we recently expressed in these pages¹ has been fulfilled by the appearance of the second series of Dr. Fraser's Gifford Lectures ; but we own to a slight feeling of disappointment. The second series seems to us rather less lucid, and rather more encumbered by repetition, than the first—partly, perhaps, because of a natural weariness on the part of the lecturer ; partly because, whereas the first series was mainly negative, the second essays the harder task of construction. But if his argument sometimes strays beyond the limits of logical cogency it is wise to remember that the fundamental thesis of the writer is that other faculties besides the logical have a rightful place in the structure of a truly human philosophy ; and that such a philosophy is, by the nature of the case, necessarily imperfect, because it is the work of an intelligence neither tied to verse-readings, according to Mr. Spencer, nor identical with omniscience, according to Hegel (pp. 121 ff., 269).

The earlier pages of this volume resume the Moral Foundation of Theism (p. 8 ff.) No science—no thought at all—is possible except on the assumption that the universe is a realm of order. But may not this order be purely mechanical and unmoral ? It may be answered that order is itself necessarily moral, because order is an expression of Truth, and Truth is a moral as well as an intellectual conception. A sounder answer may be found in the moral constitution of man. If he is moral it is because he finds himself standing in the presence of a moral Power. If he says, 'I ought,' his conscience echoes a Voice which says, 'Thou oughtest.' But there is still a difficulty. The Power which says 'Thou oughtest' might itself remain unmoral : morality might express what God commands and not what God is. It seems no answer to this theory to say that it plunges the thinker into the most hopeless confusion ; for moral agnosticism might be miserable yet true (p. 21). But we are convinced, with Dr. Fraser, that faith in a final moral Principle is as elementary and fundamental as faith in a final intellectual Principle. If it is impossible for man to believe in a universe which is a chaos, it is no less practically impossible to believe in a universe which is a fraud. And if the Power at the root of the universe is an unmoral Power, how could there arise among its effects moral and responsible man ?

Dr. Fraser, then, does not hesitate to accept the testimony of

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1897.

conscience to a perfectly moral First Cause. The meaning of the universe 'is finally revealed . . . in the voice of conscience, with its sense of eternally underlying righteousness alone. Is not this the conception of the Whole which—I do not say by strict logical necessity of the understanding I *must* take—but which I *ought* to take?' (p. 11). We find some sagacious remarks (p. 15) on Kant's refutation of logical proofs of God, which is interpreted (we think rightly) to mean not that God is unknowable, but that there is need of a faculty other than the logical by which to know Him. There are also good remarks (p. 65) on the Argument from Design—an argument which has greatly ceased to convince when it is concerned with details of adaptation, but is as forcible as ever when it appeals to the orderliness of the universe as a whole.

Passing reluctantly by these points we come to the chapters in which Dr. Fraser recognizes, and takes great pains to solve, some of the difficulties in the way of Theistic Philosophy, reminding us that if there are difficulties on the theistic side, we do not escape from difficulties still more serious when we try to think out the universe without Theism. He considers specially the four difficulties of Evil, Progress, Miracles, and Death.

(1) If the world be the work of omnipotent Goodness, whence comes into it the evident occurrence of things which are as they ought not to have been? (p. 142 ff.) Dr. Fraser rejects the theory of the purely negative character of evil, because evil is practically felt to be a real power (p. 165). Whence comes it? If from God, then His holiness is assailed. If from an evil deity, then the ultimate truth of the universe is dual confusion, not unity and order. But conscience testifies that man has received a faculty of self-determination, or, in a sense, creation, by which he can originate a course of action. Does the entrusting to him of such a power indicate imperfect goodness or imperfect wisdom in the Creator? Dr. Fraser rejects (p. 185) Leibniz's optimism, which assumes that evil is permitted as the necessary occasion for greater good; for evil still remains evil, whatever use may be made of it, unless evil is, after all, only an imperfect form of good. But he points out that such originative power is the only means by which real moral goodness on the part of men could be produced. If man were a mere machine, bound to turn out virtuous actions to order, he would be a *thing* and not a *person*; and it may well be more divine to create persons who, being free to choose between good and evil, are free to be voluntarily good, than to create things which cannot be morally good at all (p. 184).

Evil, then, is due to the misuse of a faculty given that we may be voluntarily good. But is not evil too prevalent for human self-determination to be the sole cause of it? We regret that Dr. Fraser gives some countenance to the theory that part of the evil may have been originated by men in some pre-existent state (pp. 190, 281). Such a theory seems to us baseless, and inconsistent with the function of memory in amending character, and perhaps to involve the grotesque supposition that a person might, in successive incarna-

tions
really
Dr.
doct
his,
It w
cons
the v
a wo
(
diffi
the v
of C
the
perf
' not
like
(
The
whic
cont
of E
ther
need
mira
of t
prov
itself
worl
but
Fraser
so u
Plat
state
we l
Him
phil
sens
satis
cons
and
whic
natu
cons
othe
tion
The
man

tions, be repeatedly regenerated in Baptism. Moreover it does not really solve the difficulty, but only puts it back a stage. We wish Dr. Fraser had shown how consistent with reason is the Christian doctrine that other creatures besides man, with wider spheres than his, have received the like originative power and have misused it. It were well if those who lightly deny the personality of Satan would consider that such a denial either throws the whole responsibility of the world's misery on man, or else casts on God the blame of making a world which is, as we see it, in many respects very evil.

(2) With such a view of evil the problem of Progress offers little difficulty (p. 192 ff.) Progress implies, indeed, the imperfection of the universe as it is; but if it is consistent with Theism to conceive of God as allowing originative wills which can and do choose evil, the world is confessedly not perfect, and may progress towards perfection. Thus too we can account for the fact that progress is 'not like a Roman road, which goes straight to its goal; it is rather like a winding river, frequently forced to turn backward' (p. 203).

(3) A similar account can be given of Miracles (p. 216 ff.) They imply a certain imperfection in the working of the universe, which needs to be occasionally supplemented. But if the universe contains persons as well as things, and those persons have the power of bringing into existence that which ought not to have been, may there not be reason why these abnormal forces should sometimes need to be rectified by unusual action on God's part? And if miracles are, after all, found to form a part, not yet comprehended, of the ordinary course of nature, this would only show that God provides in nature a cure for the evil which He allows to intrude itself into nature. With Leibniz Dr. Fraser holds that 'when God works miracles He does it not in order to supply the wants of *nature*, but those of *grace*' (p. 236).

(4) With respect to Death, and man's possible survival, Dr. Fraser preserves a philosophical reticence (p. 240 ff.) The case is so unique that little can be learned from analogy. He disallows the Platonic notion of an indissoluble soul surviving in a disembodied state the decay of the flesh; but maintains that, as on other grounds we have a reasonable faith in a perfect First Cause, we may trust Him in this case also not to suffer us to be confounded.

The characteristic which we value most highly in Dr. Fraser's philosophy is that he boldly claims a place in it for other than the sensitive and the logical faculties. As a philosophy must aim at satisfying the whole man, so the whole man must take part in the construction of it. In his system the testimony of the conscience and the freedom of the will are not set aside as perplexing things for which a precarious place must be found at the end of a study of natural causation. They take their place as prime elements of self-consciousness, mysterious indeed, but not more mysterious than other truths, and demanding their place among the solid foundations, and not among the insecure pinnacles, of human thought. There is thus a mystery left which logic cannot solve, but in which man can live. The conclusion is, in a sense, agnostic, for 'we

know' only 'in part ;' but it finds room for faith by which we have communion with the Perfect.

The Bible: its Meaning and Supremacy. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury. (London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

THE writings of the Dean of Canterbury are becoming increasingly like the fatal gift of Æolus to Ulysses. Given a subject, there pours from his ready pen such a turmoil of quotation, motto, illustration, anecdote, bedizened platitude, vituperation, shrieking and pomposity, that we are inclined to think that the four winds loosed from their prison would be more peaceful company. It is sad to see such eminent gifts of language and memory and enthusiasm rendered distasteful, and almost useless, by the lack of discipline, and by an unbounded egotism. The chief purpose of this book seems to be to show that the traditional Puritan and Protestant conception of the Bible as the one infallible guide to truth, literally and verbally inspired, or rather dictated, by the Holy Ghost, is altogether impossible. It is pointed out that this conception is false to history, and to what we know of God's dealings with men (cc. i.-iii.) ; that we must recognise the human element in Scripture ; the progressive and partial morality of the Old Testament (cc. iv., v.) ; the varying degrees of spirituality in the different books of the canon (viii. &c.) ; the danger of quoting isolated texts from any part of Scripture, as if they were in themselves conclusive as to doctrine or morals (xvi. &c.) There is, of course, nothing new in all this ; but had it been set forth quietly, reverently, and in a Catholic spirit, with that power of making a subject interesting and popular which the Dean undoubtedly possesses, the result would have been a useful book, and a real help towards removing vulgar misconceptions of revelation. But as it is the book is marred by fundamental defects. We would draw attention especially to Chapter xiii., which gives the key to the writer's principles, or lack of principles. This chapter is entitled 'The Bible not the only Source from which we can learn of God.' The other sources it mentions are these—History, Biography, Nature, and Conscience. Where is the teaching of the Church? We look in vain for any adequate conception of it in this chapter or elsewhere. All that we are left with is a number of vague and rhetorical generalities about the guidance of the Holy Ghost, which apparently is to be looked for just as much in the utterances of gifted individuals as in the judgment of the Universal Church. For, on the one hand, Luther is quoted with approval because he, 'relying on the promised guidance of the Spirit of God, "sought for the Canon in the Canon"' (though it is admitted that his judgment about St. James and the Apocalypse was wrong) (p. 28). On the other hand, we are warned against considering even the decisions of Ecumenical Councils as infallible (p. 33). The writer's attitude towards Catholic interpretations is illustrated by one of his customary tilts at what he calls 'the deadly system of auricular confession' (pp. 211-13).

He ca
hones
is thro
tation
voice
exper
a voic
essen
canno
for th
brush
infalli
some
Balaan
the sta
the pr
of the
to mis

U
found
Bible

Simple
an
ch
A

THIS l
wide m
and bl
Beatit
Most
is on
author
of the
which
it, 'the
mons
certain
as a m
seems
positio
trovers
and wi
and sol
express
The sp

The simple fact is that the Dean's position is—

'Wandering between two worlds, one dead,
The other powerless to be born.'

He cannot be a thoroughgoing Protestant—he is too learned and too honest for that. And he will not be a Catholic. Consequently he is thrown back upon merely natural and human canons of interpretation, and practically makes no difference in principle between the voice of God as it is heard in the gradual development of human experience and research, and as it speaks in the Universal Church, a voice which, in spite of many surface variations in tone, is yet in its essence one and unchanging and supernatural. Consequently we cannot be surprised that Dean Farrar has nothing but condemnation for the mystical interpretation of Scripture (c. iv.); that he lightly brushes away with a few words the solemn question of our Lord's infallibility (pp. 127-8); that he treats in a most cavalier manner some of the miracles of the Old Testament—e.g., the speech of Balaam's ass becomes 'the language of a warm imagination' (p. 228); the standing still of the sun and moon a mere poetical expression of the providence of God in the battle of Bethhoron; while to get rid of the miracle of Jonah he is reduced partly to discredit and partly to misunderstand the words of our Lord in St. Matthew xii. (p. 240).

Upon the whole, the chief value of this book is that it will be found a storehouse of quotations and anecdotes bearing upon the Bible and the opinions of men concerning it.

Simplicity in Christ. Sermons preached in St. Paul's Cathedral and elsewhere by the Venerable WILLIAM MACDONALD SINCLAIR, D.D., Archdeacon of London, &c. (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., 1896.)

THIS book contains twelve sermons, well printed in large type, with wide margins and rough edges, also a handsome title-page in red and black. Six of the sermons are an incomplete course on the Beatitudes, preached in St. Paul's; the rest are on various subjects. Most of the twelve have a controversial flavour; indeed, the second is on 'The Duty and Spirit of Controversy.' We gather that the author regards himself as having a mission to warn against the errors of the Roman Church, and whatever tends in that direction, under which head he evidently classes the Oxford Movement, or, as he calls it, 'the crusade of Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey' (p. 40). The sermons display undoubted power of language and illustration, and a certain earnestness. But unfortunately they also show their author as a man of singular narrowness of mind. On some subjects he seems quite incapable of even trying to understand the opposite position, to say nothing of being fair to it. And his style of controversy is peculiarly irritating, for while he condemns unreservedly, and with an air of having said absolutely the last word on very great and solemn subjects, he indulges in gratuitous and somewhat feline expressions of affection for those whose convictions he condemns. The spirit of his controversy with those whom he calls 'our beloved

brethren of the Roman persuasion' is well seen in the first sermon, on Unity. In this he apologizes for Independents, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, even Unitarians, but for Roman Catholics he has no allowance to make. All he can say is that they 'represent three disastrous ideas' (p. 14). Similarly, throughout the book he treats his hearers, in the threadbare and familiar style of the Protestant lecturer, to harrowing descriptions of St. Bartholomew's Day, the Marian martyrs, and select tit-bits from Roman casuists. We do not think this style of controversy does the least good to any one, unless it be to those attacked. Roman controversy in these days demands not only protestations of charity, but that realization of charity which consists in being fair to your opponent. And, above all, it demands a real knowledge of Catholic truth, and a loyalty to it. How far the Archdeacon of London is qualified in these ways we will leave the reader to judge by laying before him a few examples. The Archdeacon thus apologizes for Presbyterianism. They 'represent the principle of the original identity of presbyters and bishops. That brings them very near indeed to ourselves' (p. 15). The Introduction to the Ordinal seems strangely to ignore this 'principle.' And we presume it is to further emphasize this nearness (or is it a holiday reminiscence?) that the Archdeacon says in another sermon, 'When we sit or kneel around the Lord's Board' (p. 102).

Again he gives us as a definition of the Eucharist that it is 'a renewal of the Covenant by the symbolical participation in the heavenly feast opened to us by the complete, finished, and never-to-be-repeated Sacrifice of the Cross' (p. 104). Consequently 'the fanciful view of the Schoolmen, that it is an extension of the Incarnation, finds no support in the New Testament, in the Primitive Church, or in the Book of Common Prayer' (*ibid.*). We fear that the Archdeacon has never grasped the full meaning of the Incarnation itself. He sees no alternative between the heresy of the Capharnaïtes and a Zwinglian, or at most a Calvinistic, view of the Eucharist, such as his own. Otherwise he would scarcely quote St. John vi. 63 as conclusive against the belief he is attacking. He takes no pains even to be accurate. He says, 'The persons who hold this view lay stress on every allusion to the Incarnation, not on the Death and Passion. They pray that they may perpetually perceive in themselves the fruits of their participation' (p. 105). We suppose he is alluding to the words of the well-known Collect, 'Deus, qui nobis sub Sacramento mirabili,' &c. He has apparently never read it, so he may be comforted to know that the last word is 'redemption' and not 'participation.' And with monstrous effrontery he tells his hearers that 'it is on account of this unscriptural view that some insist on fasting Communion' (*ib.*). Fasting Communion, then, is a mere corollary of a 'fanciful view of the Schoolmen'!

We go on to look for a moment at the Archdeacon's view on the Eucharistic Sacrifice. He says:

'There is nothing in the whole New Testament about Christ pleading His sacrifice in Heaven. It amounts to a mistake, a direct contradiction of the Article of the Creed, "He sitteth at the right hand of God." . . .

The Sacrifice is in eternal activity only in the same sense that any other event or act of His life is an eternal activity; if we take up such language, we must say that He is perpetually born, perpetually teaching in the Temple, . . . perpetually supping with the Pharisee,' &c., &c.

In contrast to this solemn trifling we turn to the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'Jesus, made an high-priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.' Has the Archdeacon ever tried seriously to take in what these words mean? Would he be content to treat the mediatorial Sovereignty of Christ in the same way that he does the Priesthood?

Once more, the Archdeacon deliberately ignores the existence of a form of private and direct absolution in the Prayer Book. Indeed, he practically condemns such an absolution by saying, 'In God's teaching there is no ground . . . for insisting that his (the priest's) voice, legitimately pardoning our sins, is to be heard as that of Christ Himself, who said to the palsied man, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee"' (p. 156). And we are not surprised to find the Archdeacon in a complete Protestant fog as to the meaning of 'penance.' 'And as for satisfaction imposed by a priest, our Church teaches that "the offering of Christ once made is that perfect satisfaction,"' &c. (p. 158). The Archdeacon's attacks on Catholic practices may remind us of the proverbial old lady sweeping out the Atlantic with a besom. There is undoubtedly a humorous side to them; but to our minds the sad side is more prominent. That one who is a member of the Chapter of St. Paul's should show himself so obtrusively blind to the meaning of the most solemn act of worship of the Christian Church is bad enough. But to endeavour to make light of, to misrepresent and discourage the precious privilege so sorely needed by a sin-laden world, of receiving a personal absolution for sin confessed to God in the presence of His priest, seems to us little less than a crime.

Religious Teaching in Secondary Schools: Suggestions to Teachers and Parents for Lessons on the Old and New Testaments, Early Church History, Christian Evidences, &c. By the Rev. GEORGE C. BELL, M.A., Master of Marlborough College. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1897.)

WE welcome the appearance of this excellent little book. It is an attempt by a well-known and successful headmaster to raise the standard of religious teaching in secondary schools. Such an attempt is sorely needed. The average religious instruction given in the higher schools of this country is utterly inadequate. Boys and girls—the children of Christian, and in most cases of Church, parents—are going out to the universities, to the professions, to the higher stations of public and social life, with less knowledge of the Bible and less appreciation of its claim and meaning than many a child in our National schools. Mr. Bell does not ignore this fact, nor its causes. He speaks of the 'haziness' or unsettled belief of many of the teachers (pp. 13-15), of the absence of any right scheme of religious teaching, or worthy conception of the end of such teaching.

And he complains, rightly, of the entirely inadequate standard often set up by examiners in religious knowledge (pp. 18-21). Consequently, even the very short time which a school time-table assigns to 'Divinity' is often spent merely in dry details of Scripture history, 'got up' from some manual; or if the subject be the Greek Testament, teachers 'who know or like Greek better than Divinity' find 'a convenient neutral ground in the "ecbatic and telic" senses of *iva* or the peculiar uses of *μη*' (p. 81).

But Mr. Bell does not despair of improvement; and he is clearly of opinion that, even in the limited time usually assigned to this subject, much may be done if only the aim and method are right. So in this little book he first sets before the teacher clearly, reverently, even solemnly, what is the object of all religious teaching: 'The ultimate aim of the Christian teacher is to lead his pupils to the Father through Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, that they may grow up in the love of God and man' (pp. 1-2). Again: 'The Christian teacher looks on Jesus Christ as the centre of the history of religion; all that goes before converges to Him, all that comes after radiates from Him' (p. 25). He then suggests leading principles by which to interpret the Old and New Testaments, and gives concise and most carefully thought-out schemes of subjects. He also deals with some of the modern difficulties with regard to the Bible, especially with the Higher Criticism. Lastly, he gives a scheme of instruction on Christian Evidences (chap. vi.) which, he tells us, was actually given to a sixth form in 1891 and 1893. Throughout Mr. Bell is reverent, broad-minded, and inspiring, and shows wide reading and a love of the Bible. We cannot, however, follow him altogether in his treatment of the Higher Criticism. He is a moderate adherent of this system, though we are pleased to see that he practically rejects the 'Kenosis' theory (p. 126). It is perfectly true that the teacher ought to know something of the questions raised by the Higher Criticism; it is also true that he need not be tied to a hard and mechanical theory of inspiration; but we do not see the wisdom of suggesting, even to advanced and inquiring scholars, that, *e.g.*, there are 'doubts (or even definite conclusions) respecting the traditional date and authorship of the book of Daniel' (p. 48). For ourselves we cannot see that such 'doubts' or 'conclusions' can stand either with reverence or logic. But, at any rate, we think that those using this book would do well to confine themselves to the constructive part, and we should be much surprised if they found any need to support a wavering faith by the suicidal methods of the Higher Criticism. Holy Scripture interpreted as Mr. Bell would have teachers interpret it is its own best apologist. He will be a wise teacher, moreover, who does not try to explain everything, but is willing to leave some difficulties unsolved. With this reservation we cordially recommend this book to teachers, and especially to examiners. The latter have much to answer for. As Mr. Bell more than once points out, they are practically responsible for the style of religious instruction given in our schools; though, indeed, 'character and principle, piety, reverence, and the love of

rig
cula
whic
teach
to in
Gas

TH
chap
mag
auth
was
befo
so i
like
littl
and
mea
pain
mor
to t
train
Mr.
awa
cen
poet
In
corn
He
Pag
wou
scar
duc
of I
of i
the
hou
love
Mo
The
life
Mr.
gest
is a
ciat
ing
ten

righteousness, may not be expressible in written answers nor calculable in marks' (p. 60). Yet, when examiners learn to set papers which endeavour to draw out knowledge of the religious and moral teaching of the Bible, the teachers themselves will have to endeavour to impart this, and therefore to learn it.

Gaston de Latour. An unfinished Romance. By WALTER PATER, late Fellow of Brasenose College. Prepared for the press by CHARLES L. SHADWELL, Fellow of Oriel College. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.)

THIS can hardly be called a posthumous work, for six of its seven chapters had appeared during the author's lifetime in the pages of magazines. And yet there is a pathetic interest attaching to it. The author, a scholar of singularly attractive though hidden personality, was a remarkably progressive thinker. And death stayed his hand before it could, perhaps, be clearly seen, as in the case of this book, so in his own, in what conclusion he would rest. *Gaston de Latour*, like *Marius the Epicurean*, as Mr. Shadwell tells us in his tasteful little preface, is 'the history of the spiritual development of a refined and cultivated mind' (p. vi). But in both the interest is by no means confined to the central figure. The setting is exquisitely painted. Indeed, the pictures of contemporaries are, if anything, more vivid than that of the hero. In *Marius* the scenery belonged to the golden autumn of Imperial Rome, and was enriched by portraits of Marcus Aurelius, Lucian, and others. In *Gaston de Latour* Mr. Pater has described a past which seems in some respects further away from us than Rome of the Antonines, France of the sixteenth century, and he introduces the figures of Pierre de Ronsard, lay-prior, poet, and amourist, Montaigne, and Bruno the Dominican pantheist. In *Marius* the progress of thought, or perhaps, to speak more correctly, of sympathy, is from a refined Paganism to Christianity. Here we see traditional Christianity brought face to face with neo-Paganism, æsthetic and intellectual. It is probable that the story would have ended in a return to the old faith, but the battle is scarcely beginning when the fragment ends. Gaston himself is introduced, in the first chapter, as a youth of noble family in the district of La Beauce, passing his early years in seclusion and a narrow circle of inherited traditions. He chooses the priestly calling, and receives the tonsure at the age of sixteen from the Bishop of Chartres, whose household he joins. Next we see him startled and awakened by the love-poetry of Ronsard, then learning suspense of judgment from Montaigne, and lastly confronted by the daring idealism of Bruno. There is nothing new, of course, in all this. It is a story of the inner life which repeats itself under different conditions in every age. But Mr. Pater had begun to tell it again in his most graceful and suggestive manner. His style, in spite of affectation and fastidiousness, is always an agreeable change from the commonplace. He appreciated language enough to take real pains with it; and though his writing is lacking in strength and persuasiveness, it is always sympathetic, tender, and thoughtful, with a suggestive undertone of the pathos of

human life, 'the sense of tears in mortal things.' Perhaps Mr. Pater is at his best in describing with delicate allusiveness the ceremonies and sanctities of the Catholic Church. What could be more felicitous than this 'appreciation' of the Office for the Ninth Hour?—

'It was like a stream of water crossing unexpectedly a dusty way—*Mirabilia testimonia tua!* In psalm and antiphon, inexhaustibly fresh, the soul seemed to be taking refuge, at that undevout hour, from the sordid languor and the mean business of men's lives, in contemplation of the unfaltering vigour of the Divine righteousness, which had still those who sought it, not only watchful in the night, but alert in the drowsy afternoon' (pp. 11–12).

Christianity, no doubt, would have won back Gaston de Latour after his spiritual wanderings, not only by its inherent beauty, but by its essential sympathy with human nature and the results of human experience, its true 'humanism.' *Anima naturaliter Christiana* is a truth which seems to have increasingly appealed to Mr. Pater in his later years. We are thankful that it was so. And yet we could wish to see in his writings some deeper sense of the severity of Christianity: its doctrine of sin, its keen contrast between nature and grace, its insistence on 'righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.' Sin seems to have presented itself to him rather as something monstrous and ugly, or something which introduces unpleasantness and pain into the world, than as an offence against a personal God. And so there is a subtle danger, even in his most Christian thought—a danger by no means imaginary in these days—of a merely æsthetic appreciation of Christianity, without any deep submission of the will. We are far from laying to the charge of Mr. Pater's memory that he would have had the least sympathy with ritualism divorced from morals. We rejoice in his remarkable witness, somewhat one-sided though it may be. But the modern danger we speak of compels us to remember that while God in revelation appears 'in perfect beauty,' it is the beauty of righteousness: 'from His right hand went a fiery law.'

Eras of the Christian Church. Edited by JOHN FULTON, D.D., LL.D. 1. 'The Age of Hildebrand.' By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.)

THIS book is the first instalment of a series, to consist of ten volumes, written by various American scholars, among whom we recognize some well-known and honoured names. The publishers in their advertisement describe the series as being 'popular monographs giving, so to speak, a bird's-eye view of the most important epochs in the life of the Church,' and suggest the hope that these may promote the cause of Christian unity.

Dr. Vincent's work deals with the development of the idea of Papal rule from Leo IX. to Boniface VIII.; while the first chapter gives a short sketch of the course of Papal history in earlier times. It will be seen that this volume covers one of the most deeply important and most fascinating portions of Church history. It is a period of the strain and conflict of Titanic forces, resulting in con-

trast.
The m
the re
manife
Above
earlier
not y
pursui
never
terror.
and a
carry o
and th
Co
The h
this h
take a
endeav
beliefs
deavou
sympa
His b
certain
which
downf
uncon
forget
detests
concep
into t
only th
aberra
some
histori
scarcel
Aquin
'The e
secure
of life.
pose o
vocation
unders
as this
loved
not for
was sin
which
and co
'He
learnin
VOL

trasts and paradoxes at once splendid, grotesque, and bewildering. The most intense belief in the truth of the Christian revelation and the reality of Christ's kingdom upon earth exists side by side with manifestations of the most barbaric and unregenerate human nature. Above all it was the age of idealists—Hildebrand, Barbarossa, the earlier Schoolmen. The vigour of the young Western nations had not yet been damped by failure nor diverted into the exclusive pursuit of material interests. Hildebrand is a phenomenon we can never contemplate without admiration, scarcely without awe and terror. He represents the rare, almost unique, combination of a lofty and all-embracing idealism, a courage, intellectual and moral, to carry out in every detail what faith and imagination had suggested, and the opportunity of doing it on the largest scale.

Consequently it is no easy task to write the history of this time. The historian must first be interpreter rather than judge. And for this he must be in thorough sympathy with his subject. He must take a wide and generous view of human nature. Above all, he must endeavour to put away personal feeling in interpreting religious beliefs and ideals. We cannot say that Dr. Vincent, though he endeavours to be fair, possesses those qualifications. He is out of sympathy with his period; and he has not even made it interesting. His book shows considerable reading and some ability. He has certainly traced the history of Papal claims, shown the mistakes on which they seem to be based, and the causes which led to their downfall. But still the general effect is dull and disappointing. He unconsciously belittles all that is great in his period. He cannot forget that he himself, professor in the Union Theological Seminary, detests alike the Hildebrandine idea of the Church and the Catholic conception of authority. He does not seem to be able to enter into the unearthly depths of religious feeling which underlie not only the movements of the Preaching Friars, but even such strange aberrations as the Flagellants. No doubt he has been fettered somewhat by his limited purpose, 'to make all personalities and all historical details tributary to the main theme' (xii.), but we can scarcely forgive him for telling us no more, *e.g.*, of Thomas Aquinas than just his name. He repeats the wearisome platitude, 'The essence of monasticism was selfish—the effort of the individual to secure his own salvation by repudiating all the duties and responsibilities of life.' That a man might become a monk with the primary purpose of the glory of God, and as the response to a supernatural vocation, Dr. Vincent, in common with most Protestants, cannot understand. And his general tone is illustrated by such passages as this criticism of Hildebrand's famous dying words: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity." Did he believe it? It is not for us to say. There is no delusion like moral delusion. If he was sincere, we can only pray to be delivered from the righteousness which Hildebrand loved' (p. 116). Or, again, let us take this crude and commonplace conclusion about Abélard:

'He met the fate which always attends the inroad of thought and learning into the snug retreats of fixed belief and accepted tradition.

VOL. XLIV.—NO. LXXXVIII.

M M

His disaster was due, largely, to his own unrestrained passion and arrogance; but he carries with him the sympathy of all open-eyed and fair-minded men by his courage in the fight against a bloated ecclesiastical conservatism, and a lethargic submission to authority in matters of faith' (p. 206).

We are not always sure of Dr. Vincent's accuracy in details. For example, it is misleading to say 'William [the Conqueror] refused the profession of obedience to Rome' (p. 102). What he refused was to do homage for his kingdom to the Pope as feudal lord. Again, Charlemagne was crowned Emperor at Rome on Christmas Day, 800, and not in November (p. 10). And speaking of Manichæism (p. 303), he says: 'From one of its leaders, Paul of Samosata, the system acquired the name of Paulicianism.' Probably the name was taken from St. Paul; and besides, the expression 'Paul of Samosata' has been so appropriated by historians to the earlier heretic that it is a pity to use it of quite a different person.

Without wishing to condemn altogether Dr. Vincent's book, we cannot praise it, nor recommend it as a real contribution to the history of the Middle Ages. There is still much need for careful, sympathetic work at this complicated and little-understood period. The historian need not himself be either a Romanist, or even a Catholic, to understand and interpret it. Witness such brilliant monographs as Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, or Storr's *Bernard of Clairvaux*. But he must at least be slow to deliver judgment on motives and characters; and he must endeavour, in the weighty words of the Bishop of Oxford, at the conclusion of his *Constitutional History*, 'to base his arguments on nothing less sacred than that highest justice which is found in the deepest sympathy with erring and straying men.'

Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1897. Being a Statistical Book of Reference for Facts relating to the Clergy and the Church; with a fuller Index of Facts relating to the Parishes and Benefices of England and Wales and Ireland, and to the Charges, Missions, &c., of Scotland and of the Colonies, and of Europe, North Africa, and the Mediterranean, than any ever yet given to the Public. Twenty-ninth issue. (London: Horace Cox, 1897.)

WE have been at pains to set out in full what we find on the title-page of this most admirable work in order that our readers may see at a glance what a vast repertory of invaluable information on matters clerical this volume of 2,075 pages places at their disposal. The Editor says: 'The writing of the Preface to this work does not become a lighter matter as years go on.' If it be not a 'light matter' for him, he certainly has the knack of making it both light and bright to his readers. We have not known for years a more sparkling bit of light reading than the Prefaces to *Crockford*. After reading them and noting the curious *tit-bits* of correspondence with which he regales us, we feel tempted to define the clergy as 'the class that makes inadmissible demands.' It never seems to occur to

them,
what
built
insert
the us
declin
'mino
But e
worm
entry
the fa
exceed

But
amusi
we ve
affect
Take,
carrie
injust
which
estima

'T
Resolu
mised
that a
ready
Royal
allowe
Resolu
till the
Parlian

We
the E
criticis
only g
they h
someth
evolve

An
'In
reason
Certain
It is th
gence
who fo
'more t
(p. xvi)

Th
and on

them, if we may judge from these specimens, to ask themselves on what lines and with what laborious care this colossal work has been built up, and whether their requests to have this or that or the other inserted under their names will mar the symmetry of the system and the usefulness of the *Directory*. No! if the Editor is compelled to decline they give him a piece of what they are pleased to call their 'mind.' They hector him, and bully him, and half threaten him. But even an editor is, presumably, a vertebrate animal, and even a worm will turn. Of the extent to which these attempts to force an entry into the *Directory* are carried, some idea may be formed from the fact disclosed to us in this Preface, '*that the matter rejected far exceeds that which is used*'!

But the interest of the Preface is not confined to stories, however amusing, of captious and silly correspondents. It deals—and deals, we venture to think, very soundly—with matters which very gravely affect the best interests of the clergy and of the Church at large. Take, for example, the following remarks on the Resolution lately carried by Mr. Round in the House of Commons on the grievous injustice done to the beneficed clergy in the matter of poor-rates, which in their case, and in their case alone, are levied, not on their estimated rental, but on their incomes:

'The attitude of Sir Michael Hicks Beach in his remarks on the Resolution are not what might have been expected from him. He promised an inquiry by a Royal Commission. It might have been thought that a Government which owes so much to the clergy might have been ready to take immediate measures for their relief without waiting for a Royal Commission. . . . It is to be hoped that the subject will not be allowed to drop, but that Mr. Round and others who have promoted the Resolution will not desist from their determination to relieve the clergy till they have succeeded in passing into law a short and practical Act of Parliament which will give effect to their intention' (p. vi).

We should like to have quoted copiously the paragraphs in which the Editor indulges in severe, but, as we think, most legitimate criticisms on Parish Councils, but our space is limited. So we can only give a sentence or two: 'A moribund Government felt that they had done nothing, and to save their credit must, if possible, do something. So out of the depths of their inner consciousness they evolved the Parish Councils Bill' (p. xv).

And yet again:

'In one point my friendly critic was strictly correct. He says the reason of my strictures on Parish Councils is not difficult to guess. Certainly it is not; for it lies on the surface, and is sufficiently obvious. It is the dislike which is shared with me by men of education and intelligence generally for the transfer of important public interests from those who formerly cared for them efficiently to a body of men who have now more than proved their incompetence and incapacity to deal with them' (p. xvi).

There are also some admirable remarks on the Education Bill and on Church Statistics, and on the lamentable decrease of clerical

incomes and increase of outgoings. On this last head the following is a case in point :

'A characteristic example of the way in which nominally high clerical incomes sink into nothing before outgoings has been furnished by a beneficed clergyman in the county of Dorset. His total income for a period of five years, including rent of the vicarage, which he is allowed to let, was 1,868*l.* *os.* 11*d.* After paying for assistant clergy, making repairs to vicarage, and meeting other inevitable deductions, *the net income left to himself was 21*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, or an average of 4*l.* 5*s.* 4*d.* a year*' (p. iv).

And yet people are to be found who pooh-pooh the crippled means of the clergy!

AB
Abra
in
Adam
and
Sa
Aur
gen
Hi
sgg
wor
148
Fa
laci
the
dot
cre
Par
of
His
of
con
tam
use
the
cor
our
pra
doc
Chu
exc
cili
pub
fess
viti
cep
tho
be
quo
tice
kno
nion
162
of t

INDEX TO VOL. XLIV.

ABB

- ABBOTT**, Mr. E. A., *The Spirit on the Waters*, 492
- Abrahams**, Mr. Israel, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, 238
- Adams**, Rev. D. C. O., *The Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era*, 491
- Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church, A History of* (Dr. Lea's work), 147 *sqq.*: general character of the work, 147; bias of the author, 148; misinterpretations of the Fathers and the Schoolmen, 149; lack of technical knowledge, 151; the author's view that the sacerdotal theory of Absolution was created by the University of Paris, 152; inadequate treatment of the teaching of Christ and of His Apostles on the forgiveness of sin, 153; the value set upon confession of sin in the Old Testament and in the New, 154; the use made of external means in the histories which the Bible records, 155; the real teaching of our Lord, *ib.*; the teaching and practice of the Church, 156; the doctrine of the Fathers, 157; the Church's penitential system: excommunication and reconciliation, 158; the change from public penance to private confession, 159; Dr. Lea's argument vitiated by his lack of a true conception of the Church, 160; though perverse, the work may be of service, *ib.*; Dr. Pusey quoted on the value of the practice of confession, 161; utility of knowing the variations of opinions which Dr. Lea has collected, 162; injury done by distortions of truth: Indulgences, 163

BRE

- BELL**, Rev. G. C., *Religious Training in Secondary Schools*, 517
- Blachford**, *Letters of Frederic [Rogers]*, Lord, 107 *sqq.*: sketch of his life, 107; at Oxford: early connexion with Newman, 108; his description of Newman, 109; details of their connexion, 110; progress of the Oxford Movement, 111; Rogers's opinion of religion in Rome, 112; differences with leaders of the Movement: farewell letter to Newman, 113; Rogers's connexion with the *Times*, 114; he accepts a post in the Civil Service, 115; assists in founding the *Guardian*, *ib.*; his work in the Colonial Office, 116; on a special mission to Paris: sketches of General MacMahon, Persigny, Prince Napoleon, 117; of English statesmen, 118; expansion of Greater Britain during his tenure of office, 119; his care for the Colonial Churches, 120; the Act he promoted for determining their future constitution, 120 *sq.*; is raised to the peerage: his life in retirement, 121; a debate in the Lords, 122; renewal of acquaintance with Newman: the Cardinal's estimate of Blachford, 122 *sq.*
- Blackwood**, *Stevenson Arthur*, *Some Records of the Life of*, 252
- Blair**, Mr. J. F., *The Apostolic Gospel*, 243
- Boyle**, Mr., *Ecclesiastical Vestments: their Origin and Significance*, 258
- Breakspear**, Nicholas (Adrian IV.) (review of *Life* by Mr. A. H. Tarleton), 335 *sqq.*: surprising lack of knowledge among Eng-

BRO

- lishmen of Breakspear's career, 335; interesting character of Mr. Tarleton's work: the illustrations, 330; Adrian's tomb: the epitaph he wrote for himself, 337; sources of information about him, *ib.*; places traditionally connected with his birth, 338; why he left England, *ib.*; in France: an Augustinian Canon, 339; Abbot of St. Rufus: made Bishop of Albano and Cardinal, 340; Papal Legate to Scandinavia: his regulation of the Church in Norway and Sweden, 340 *sq.*; return to Rome: elected Pope, 342; conflict with Arnold of Brescia, 342 *sq.*; struggle with Frederick Barbarossa: victory of the Pope, 343 *sq.*; Adrian's treatment of England and the English, 344; his bull granting Ireland to Henry II., 345; contest with William II. of Sicily, *ib.*; efforts to reconcile the Eastern and Western parts of the Church, 345 *sq.*; further contests with Barbarossa, 346; death of Adrian, 347 *sq.*; character, 348
- Brooke, Rev. S. A., *The Old Testament and Modern Life*, 241

- CAILLARD, Miss, *On the Use of Science to Christians*, 509
- Carnegie, Rev. W. H., *Some Principles of Religious Education*, 479
- Catherine of Genoa, St., 364 *sqq.*: her silence in regard to the stirring events of her lifetime, 365; the position of her family, the Fieschi, 367; her childhood and marriage, 368; her married life, 369; her account of her conversion, 370; her abasement of humanity compared with Luther's, 371; her works of charity, 372; conversion of her husband, 373; Catherine's distinction of the soul and the spirit, 374; her obliviousness of self, 375; view of Purgatory and Indulgences, 376; the later years of her life, 377; her death, 378; criticism as to

CHU

- Catherine's teaching: the relation of the body to the soul, 378 *sq.*; suffering as satisfaction to God, 379; the operation of Divine Grace without man's knowledge or co-operation, 380; the place of man's will, 381; consciousness of a state of sinfulness, and unconsciousness of particular instances of sin, 383; the experience of penitents, 384
- Christian Monarchy, 1 *sqq.*: Mr. Figgis's *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*: revived importance of the monarchical idea, 1; the doctrine of 'Divine Right,' 3; the Pope and the Emperor, 4; the doctrine in Scotland and England, 5; Puritan and Jesuit views on regicide, 6; Caroline teaching about kings, 7; the Jewish theocracy, 8; the ideal Christian king, 9; illustration from the Coronation Service, 11; the source of the king's authority: 17th century disputes, 12; coronation rites impress an indelible character of kingship, 14; philosophers' views, 15 *sq.*; beneficial influence of the Crown in our present Constitution, 17; the question of the lawfulness of disobedience or resistance to paramount authority, 17 *sq.*—Notice of Dr. Wickham Legg's *Sacring of the English Kings*, 20; the *sacrosancta unctio*, 19; the robes, 20; the Royal Supremacy, *ib.*; the family ties of the nation and the monarch, 21
- Church's (Dean) *Occasional Papers*, 422 *sqq.*: versatility of the writer, 423; the reviews: Carlyle's Cromwell, *ib.*; Lyell's *Explanations*, works by Dean Stanley, 424; Dean Church's view of the light thrown upon Old Testament history by the Incarnation and the Resurrection, 425; his justice in estimating the characters of great men: St. Jerome, 426; St. Bernard, Cranmer, 427; the ascetics of the early Church, 428; on the Tudor Reformers, 429; on Henry VIII. and Wol-

CRO

sey, 430; on the 'new Reformation' proposed by the Author of *Robert Elsmere*, 431; papers on the reunion of Christendom, 432; on Anglicanism, 434; on Infallibility, 435
Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1897, 522

DALE, Rev. Dr., *The Epistle of James*, &c., 234

EASTERN Liturgies (Mr.

Brightman's work), 404 *sqq.*: a second edition of Mr. Hammond's work: detailed comparison of the two, 404; Mr. Brightman's additions and improvements, 406; alteration in the mode of presenting some of the Oriental Liturgies, *ib.*; Swainson's edition as corrected by Brightman's, 407 *sq.*; the Liturgies translated into English, 408; a Glossary of technical terms, 409; treatment of the 'Syrian rite' and the 'Byzantine rite,' *ib.*; liturgical information brought together in the work, 419; the date, authorship and *provenance* of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, *ib.*; home and date of the Pseudo-Ignatius, 411; the sources from which the *Constitutions* were compiled, 411 *sq.*; subjects treated in Mr. Brightman's Appendices, 413 *sq.*; criticism of some of his statements, 415 *sq.*; the dearth of early liturgical MSS., 416; the Liturgy of Asia Minor, 417; what alterations have taken place in Eastern Liturgies? 418; those yet discovered are neither many nor of much importance: illustrations, 419; the concluding prayers of the Liturgy in the Barberini MS. compared with the present day text, 420 *sq.*

Ecclesiastical History, Lectures on (various Authors), 486

Ecclesiasticus, The Original Hebrew of a Portion of, &c. (ed. A. E. Cowley and Ad. Neubauer), 260

Ede, Rev. W. Moore, *The Attitude*

EDW

of the Church to some of the Social Problems of Town Life, 249

Education Bill, the, 213 *sqq.*: its beneficial character: exemption of Voluntary schools from local rates, and repeal of the 17s. 6d. limit, 214; special grant for necessitous schools, 265; is this special grant sufficient? *ib.*; statistics of the cost of Board and Voluntary school education, 215 *sq.*; the salaries of teachers in the two classes of schools, 218; associations of schools within certain areas: their object and work, 219; are they to be denominational? 220; the National Society's suggested scheme: the diocese should be the area, with rural deaneries for subdivisions, 221; qualifications needed in the members of the governing body, 222; they should not attempt authoritatively to interfere with details of school management, 223; nor be unmindful of the possible wants of the more fortunately circumstanced schools in their zeal to help the poorer ones, 223
 Edwardine Ordinal, the true history of the, 123 *sqq.*: need of investigating this question, which the Bull *Apostolica cura* shirked, 124; ambiguous use of the word 'intention' in that Bull, 125; the Ordinal was drawn up under like influences to the Prayer Book of 1549, which retained the idea of both sacrifice and priesthood, 126; was the Ordinal 'simplified' in translation into English? 127; the piecemeal composition of the Roman Ordinal, 129; 'Back to Scripture' the watchword of the English Reformers, 130; Bucer's 'Ratio Ordinandi' compared with the Anglican Office, 131; none of Bucer's work belongs to the part of the Ordinal on which its validity depends, 139; Cranmer's opinions at different times on Orders, 140; consideration of the objection that in the

ELA

ordination of Bishops and Priests the office conferred is not mentioned, 141; comparison of the treatment of the two Orders in the ancient part of the Roman Ordinal, 142; probable influence of Erasmus's *Paraphrase* on this part of the English Ordinal, 143; the alterations made at the Savoy Conference, 144; the Reformers desired to lessen the exaggerated view of the sacrificial character of the Priest, but not to omit a sacramental charge and commission, 145

Eland, Rev. E. H., *The Layman's Introduction to the Book of Common Prayer*, 485

FARRAR, Very Rev. Dean, *The Bible: its Meaning and Supremacy*, 514
Fraser, Dr. A. C., *Philosophy of Theism*, 511

GEE, Henry, and Hardy, W. J., *Documents illustrative of Church History*, 506

Gibson's *Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* (Dr. Gibson's second volume), 199 *sqq.*: comparison with the first volume, 200; benefit of quoting original documents illustrated in the treatment of Article XXI. (General Councils), 201; Articles XXII. (Purgatory), XXV. (Sacramental Grace), XXVIII. (the Eucharist), 202; the spiritual condition of man before the Fall, 203; Dr. Gibson's treatment of Article XIX. (Churches that have 'erred'), 204; the relation of Church authority to private judgment, 205; the doctrine of Purgatory: the intermediate state, 205 *sq.*; the reception by the wicked in the Holy Eucharist, 206; the doctrine of concomitance, 208; Regeneration, 210; the history of married clergy, 211; high character of the whole of Dr. Gibson's work, 212

Gladstone, Mr. W. E., *Later Gleanings — Theological and*

HUT

Ecclesiastical, 294 *sqq.*: chief interest of the collection, 295; 'comparative religion,' 296; defence of the 'great Chapter' (Gen. i.), 297; handling of *Robert Elsmere*, 300; Colonel Ingersoll, 302; papers on the Reformation period, 303; Puritanism, the Royal Supremacy, 304; controversy with Professor Huxley: the swine miracle at Gadara, 306; the paper on Heresy and Schism, 306 *sq.*; the position of Dissent, 307; work claimed to have been done by Nonconformists, 308; Mr. Gladstone's opinion that the laws of religion have been 'modified by circumstance,' 309; of 'genuine' and 'spurious' undenominationalism, 310; defence of the Atonement, 312; the supremacy of the Bible, 313; the 'Soliloquium' on Anglican Orders, *ib.*

HEBREW Monarchy, *The* (ed. Rev. A. Wood), 235

History of Religion, An Introduction to the (Mr. Jevons's work), 73 *sqq.*: scope of the work, 74; what 'evolution' of religions may mean, 75; the earliest historical man believed in a supernatural spirit or spirits having power over him, 76; origin of the belief in the possibility of establishing friendly relations with supernatural powers, 77; the institution of taboo, 78; totemism and sacrifice, 79; fetishism, family gods and guardian spirits, 80; tree- and plant-worship, 81; political progress and religion act mutually upon each other, 82; development of polytheism, 83; origin of priests as separate from other worshippers, *ib.*; two views of sacrifice, 84; man's state after death, 85; the Mysteries, *ib.*; origin of monotheism, 85 *sqq.*; the evolution of belief, 87

Hort, Rev. Dr., *Village Sermons*, 490

Hutton, Rev. W. H., *The Church of the Sixth Century*, 477

IMM

IMMORTALITY, *The Christian Doctrine of* (Dr. Salmond's work), 49 *sqq.*: the author's object and method, 49; the 'Ethnic Preparation': belief in immortality is the catholic belief of mankind, 51; modified forms of the belief, 52; views on the nature of the future state, 53; 'Old Testament Preparation': the elements of the doctrine—based on the Hebrew doctrines of God, of Man, of Life, and of Death, 55; the development and modification of the doctrine of Sheol, 56; and of the idea of the relation of God to man, 57; how far this view is affected by the dislocation of the Pentateuch by the 'Higher Critics,' 58; the teaching of Christ, 59; the intermediate state, 60; consequences of affirmation or denial of that state, 62; mediæval subversion of the belief, 63; consequences of the Reformers' rejection of the doctrine of Purgatory, 63; bearing of the denial of an intermediate state on the doctrine of the Resurrection, 65; consideration of objections urged against the doctrine, 67; the Apostolic teaching on immortality, 68; the objection to the severity of the punishment of the wicked, 69; the degrees of reward and punishment, 71; *progress in the world to come*, 72

KIDD, Rev. J., *Morality and Religion*, 251

Knowles, A. C., *The Belief and Worship of the Anglican Church*, 484

LIDDON, Rev. Canon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy*, 474; *Sermons Preached on Special Occasions*, 1860-1889, 475

Locke, Rev. Dr., *The Age of the Great Western Schism* ('Eras of the Christian Church'), 494

Loxley, Rev. A. P., *The Catholic Revival* (Sermons), 481

MUR

MACALISTER, Mr., *Ecclesiastical Vestments: their Development and History*, 258

Maspero's *Mémoires des Peuples* and the S.P.C.K., 449 *sqq.*: the author's qualifications for his great work, 450; description of ancient Syria, 451; the Hyksôs invasion, 452; the Beni Israel in Egypt, 444; the final defeat of the Hyksôs, 455; Syrian peoples contemporaneous with the Hyksôs, 456; Medinet Habû was a copy of a Canaanitish *Migdol*, 457; local cults in Syria, 458; the Phœnicians, *ib.*; Queen Hatshepsut and Thothmes III., 459; social life and religion of the Egyptians, 461; some exceptions to Professor Maspero's work, 462; the S.P.C.K.'s English edition: not a translation but a free paraphrase, 463; examples of blunders, 463 *sqq.*; alterations of the author's text, 465; a list of deliberate alterations and unintentional blunders and inaccuracies, 469 *sqq.*; the book worthless, 473

Meredith, George, the poetry of, 386 *sqq.*: its chief distinction: it is the work of genius, 386; comparison of Mr. Meredith's poetry with his prose, 387; his predominant note: cheerful acceptance of things as they are, 388; a minister of hope, 389; intellectual interest and fire of his work, 391; the best order in which to read his poems, 392; they are not to be hurriedly read, 394; Mr. Meredith's pleasant metres, 395; a spiritual philosophy of courageous faith, 397; delight in companionship with Earth, 398; the *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*, 400; Mr. Meredith's language and style, 401; estimate of *Modern Love*, 401 *sq.*; Mr. Swinburne's eulogy of the poem, 402

Moore, Rev. Dr., *Studies in Dante*, 228

Murphy, Rev. Dr., *A Forgotten Gospel*, 506

NEW

NEWBOLT, Rev. Canon, *The Gospel of Experience*, 262
Nicene Creed, *The* (review of the Rev. Chancellor Lias's Manual), 349 *sqq.*: the author's lack of historical accuracy and patristic knowledge, 350; his doctrinal teaching criticized: the Human Nature of Christ, 353; temptation, sin, the Fall, 355; the Sacraments: Baptism and Baptismal Regeneration, 356; Holy Eucharist, 357; its sacrificial character, 358; Absolution and Confession, 358 *sq.*: the author's doubts of the necessity of Episcopal Consecration and Ordination to preserve the Christian Ministry, 359; a misinterpretation of Canon Gore's view, 359 *n.*; the author's teaching on the Church and its fallibility, 360; suggestion that the probation of the soul may not end at death, 361; commendable points in the work, 361 *sqq.*; the functions of the Church in developing the doctrine she is commissioned to disseminate, 362; the dogmatic decisions in the early Church, 363

OUR Lord's Divine and Human Knowledge (review of Mr. H. C. Powell's *The Principle of the Incarnation*), 265 *sqq.*: Godet's statement of the Kenotic theory, 265; its dangers, 267; the philosophical problem of knowledge, 268; origin of the Empirical school of philosophy: Locke, Berkeley, Hume, 269; Transcendentalism: Kant, 271; Hamilton, Mansel, Mill, 273; how Empiricism affects theology, ethics, and science, 274; treatment of the knowledge of God by Transcendentalists, 276; Fichte, Mr. M. Arnold, 279; a golden rule, 280; Schelling's Pantheistic system, 281; consideration of Hamilton's view that no positive knowledge of infinity is possible to us, 282; how this affects the doctrine of

REY

the Incarnation, 284; our Lord's knowledge as a man, 286; St. Paul's teaching on the Beatific Vision, 287; consciousness and memory, 289; the hypostatic union, 281; Mr. Powell's theological treatment of his subject, 292

PATER, Mr. W., *Gaston de Latour*, 519
 Pilkington, Mr. E. M. S., *An Eton Playing Field*, 256
 Pollard, Mr. J., *The Land of the Monuments*, 498

REFORMED JUDAISM, 164
sqq.: the papers on Judaism read at the 'Parliament of Religions' (Chicago), 164; statistics of Jews, 165; the reformed Jew rejects race distinctions, *ib.*; accession of proselytes to Judaism at various periods, 166; amalgamation with other nations, 167; the causes of the sufferings of the Jews, 168; Jewish hatred of Christians, 169; causes of the degeneracy of the Jews, 170; the aims and beliefs of the Reformed Jews, 172; account of Moses Mendelssohn, 173; Spinoza, 174; the Anti-Semitic agitation in Germany and Russia based on false assumptions, 175; the Theology of Reformed Judaism: a reversion to the doctrines of natural religion, 176; their high opinion of Jesus of Nazareth, 177; the expectation of a personal Messiah permanently shelved, 178; a tendency to fall in generally with the spirit of the age, 179; the present position of Orthodox Judaism, 179; estimate of the position of modern Judaism by the Rev. J. H. Lord, 180 *sqq.*
Responsio Archiepiscoporum Anglicæ ad litteras apostolicas Leonis Papæ XIII. de ordinationibus Anglicanis; and English Translation of the same, 224
 Reid, Rev. H. M. R., *Books that Help the Religious Life*, 483
 Reynolds, Sir J. Russell, *Essays*

RIC

and *Addresses*, 314 *sqq.*: the author's 'incisive scientific perception,' 314; his views on the evils resulting from neglect of the study of psychology, 315; treatment of statistical fallacies, 317; 'Specialism in Medicine,' 318; need of studying different groups of facts, 319; and of all facts about man, 320; what made the author a firm believer in the Christian Faith, 321; his treatment of the conflict between belief and unbelief, 322; evolution, 323; his protest against arbitrary rejection and acceptance of different parts of our Lord's life, 324

Rich and Poor (Mrs. Bernard Bosanquet's book), 182 *sqq.*: a typical East London parish, 183; physical characteristics, 184; absence of all refining influences, 185; grades in the social scale, 185 *sq.*; an aristocracy of labour, 186; the moral change wrought by the universal desire for cheapness, 187; real character of the industrial problem, 187 *sq.*; rents and wages, 188; comparison with the position of agricultural labourers, 188 *sq.*; why the latter are drawn to towns, 189; the outcome of the gospel of Adam Smith, 190; a plea for better relations between producer and consumer, 190 *sq.*; examples in France and Vienna, 191; the seamy side: the Warden of Toynbee Hall's *Twenty Years' Retrospect*, 192; effects of the neglect of inculcating definite religious faith in the young, 193; present day attitude of the people to the Church, 193 *sq.*; wrong methods of improving it, 195; need of organization and method for the relief of distress, *ib.*; old-fashioned almsgiving, 196; charity without demoralization, 197; evils arising from the divorce of philanthropy from religious agency, 198

Roman Controversialists, Two, 21 *sqq.*: Mr. Rivington's reply to

SOU

Dr. Bright: the charge of permitted contradictory teaching in the Anglican Church, 22; criticism of his restatement of his claim that St. Peter alone 'possessed' 'the keys,' 23; interpretation of 'Petrine texts,' 24; what Mr. Rivington's theory really means, 27; his treatment of St. John xxi. 15-17, 29; of St. Luke xxii. 26, 31; St. Luke's representation of St. Peter in the Acts, 32; complete failure of Mr. Rivington's argument, 36; reply to his complaints against Dr. Bright, 38 *sqq. n.*; Dom Chapman's article 'The Holy See and Pelagianism,' 38 *sqq.*; his statements of the African Church's position towards the Roman Church; Tertullian, 39; St. Cyprian, 40; Optatus, and St. Augustine, 41; the appeal of Coelestius to 'the Apostolic see,' 42; St. Jerome and the Origenist 'heresy,' *ib.*; the Councils of Carthago and Milevis and Innocent I., 43; the letter of the five bishops to Innocent, and his replies, 44; Dom Chapman's defence of Mr. Rivington's use of 'Roma locuta est, causa finita est,' 46; the African bishops and Zosimus, 47; condemnation of Romanist methods of controversy, 48

SANDFORD, Bishop (Gibraltar), *A Pastoral Letter*, 258
 Simpson, Mr. W., *The Buddhist Praying Wheel*, 237
 Sinclair, Ven. Archdeacon, *Simplicity in Christ*, 515
 Smith, Dr. Goldwin, *Guesses at the Riddle of Existence*, 245
 Smith, Mr. C. E., *In the Household of Faith*, 253
 South Africa, the Church in, 89 *sqq.*: a century's changes in Africa, 89; increased responsibilities of English Churchmen, 90; Dr. Wiegman's *History of the English Church and People in South Africa*, Miss Benham's

SOW

Life of Bishop Callaway, and Dr. Cust's *Gospel Message*, 91 *sqq.*; early history of the Church in South Africa, 93; its condition in 1847, 94; 'working' missionaries, 95; special mission to the Kaffirs, 96; troubles arising from Dr. Colenso's appointment to Natal, 97; the Kaffir College at Zonnenbloem, 98; estimate of Bishop Gray, *ib.*; difficulties of the Kaffrarian mission, 100; account of Bishop Callaway, 101; his methods, 102; his knowledge of the people, their language and history, 103; rapid consolidation of the Church, *ib.*; women missionaries: Miss Blennerhasset, 104; the Church in South Africa comprises a microcosm of Church history in all ages, 105

Sowing to the Spirit (Anon.), 250

Syriac Version of the Apocalypse,

A hitherto unpublished (review of Dr. Gwynn's work), 325 *sqq.*: account of the Syriac New Testament: the Peshitto canon, the Philoxenian version, 326; revision by Thomas of Harkel: manuscript authority for it, 327; distinguishing characteristics of its method, 328; answer to objections against the Harkleian authorship of Revelation, 329; recovered portions of the Philoxenian version, 330; the Beza Codex, 331; Pococke's edition of the Epistles compared with the Harkleian version, 332; character, origin, and history of the MS. used by Dr. Gwynn, 334

WAR

TEXTUAL criticism of the New Testament, the, 437 *sqq.*: the second volume of the work by the late Dean Burgon and Mr. Miller, 437; their classification of the causes of the corruption of the New Testament text, 438; the question of the soundness or unsoundness of the Westcott-Hort theory not affected by their argument, 440; Dr. Salmon's work on the textual criticism of the New Testament: his notice of the Burgon-Miller work, 441; criticism of the nomenclature adopted in Hort's *Introduction*, 441 *sq.*; the Alexandrian character of Hort's 'Neutral' text, 442; speculations as to the source of the 'Western' text, 443; difficulties of the problem, 444; Dr. Salmon's view, 445; the origin of the 'Syrian' or 'traditional' text, *ib.*; bearing of the synoptic problem on textual questions in the first three Gospels, 446; the proper method of treating the theory laid down in Hort's *Introduction*, 448

Tee, E., *The Sanctuary of Suffering*, 508

VAN DYKE, Rev. Dr., *The Gospel for an Age of Doubt*, 240

Vernon, Hon. W. W., *Readings on the Purgatorio of Dante*, 501

Vincent, Rev. Dr., *The Age of Hildebrand* ('Eras of the Christian Church'), 520

WARREN, Rev. C. F. S., *The Dies Ira*, 482

the New
sqg. :
the work
n and
ssifica-
corrup-
at text,
sound-
West-
affected
; Dr.
textual
ument :
Miller
he no-
Hort's
Alex-
Hort's
lations
estern'
of the
lmon's
of the
xt, *ib.* ;
problem
ne first
proper
ory laid
nn, 448
Suffer-

the Gos-
bt, 240
ings on
501
Age of
Chris-

s., *The*